

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSO-  
CIATION AT BALTIMORE

IT is the established practice of the American Historical Association to hold its annual meeting one year in an eastern city, one year in a western city, and the third year in Washington, which, according to the charter, is the official headquarters. Now that East and West have come to be terms of such dubious import, it may be well to explain that the geographical centre of the membership is nearly at Pittsburgh, so that eastern must be taken to mean farther east, western farther west, than that town. Since Baltimore, so near the Capital, would run little chance of being selected as the meeting-place of a year immediately after a Washington meeting, and since many annual meetings have been held in the latter city and none in Baltimore, it was agreed that the meeting of December, 1905, normally a Washington meeting, should be held chiefly in Baltimore, with a supplementary session in Washington. The American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, instituted two years ago, and the still newer Bibliographical Society of America also held their annual meetings in Baltimore at the same time.

The hospitality for which Baltimore has long been noted was abundantly manifested, both in the social entertainments themselves and in the careful preparations which had been made beforehand for the comfort and convenience of the guests by the local committee of arrangements, and especially by Mr. Theodore Marburg, its chairman, and by Professor John M. Vincent of the Johns Hopkins University, chairman of the committee on programme. There was a reception of the gentlemen of the associations at the house of Mr. Theodore Marburg, and at the same hours a reception of the ladies at the house of the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America; a "smoker" on the next evening, and simultaneously

(491)

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—33.

another reception of ladies, by Mrs. William M. Ellicott, at the Arundell Club; and on one afternoon Mrs. Charles J. Bonaparte threw open her very interesting house to the ladies. If it was possible for any of the ladies, members of the Association, to feel regret that its unity should be lessened at these meetings by the provision of so many occasions for their separate entertainment, doubtless they felt compensated by the unusual grace and kindness with which they were entertained. All the members were entertained at luncheon by the Johns Hopkins University on the first day, by the Bishop of Maryland and Mrs. Paret on the second, and by the Washington members, at the Library of Congress, on the third.

Nearly all the sessions in Baltimore were held at the university, and chiefly in McCoy Hall, an agreeable and commodious place. The evils attendant upon divers meeting-places and city travel were thus minimized. The business session was held in the rooms of the Maryland Historical Society, on Thursday afternoon. On Friday morning a special train conveyed the members to Washington by way of Annapolis, where Governor Warfield received them in the historic senate-chamber of the old State House, and where the United States Naval Academy was also visited. The number of registrations was two hundred and seventy-six, a number even greater than at the Chicago meeting, and it may be presumed that in respect to attendance of members the twenty-first annual meeting was the most successful ever held. Its programme was also of high excellence.

The number of formal papers presented was, to advantage, made less than usual. But this advantage was more than neutralized by the indifference with which nearly all the readers of papers regarded that rule of the Association which limits papers to twenty minutes. The length of some was nearer to forty minutes than to twenty—a gross abuse of the notorious patience and amiability of the profession.

Good as several of the papers were, and large as was the general audience which they elicited, it seems probable that the four round-table conferences awakened a keener interest on the part of the members. These conferences were organized on much the same plan which was so successful last year at Chicago; but it was an improvement that only two were held at the same time. Actual joint sessions with the American Economic Association were not attempted. The first evening (Tuesday, December 26) was devoted to a joint session of the American Historical and the American Political Science Association.

On this occasion, after an address of welcome by President Ira

Remsen of the Johns Hopkins University, presidential addresses were delivered by Professor Frank J. Goodnow of Columbia University, president of the American Political Science Association, and by Professor John B. McMaster of the University of Pennsylvania, president of the American Historical Association. Professor Goodnow's subject was "The Growth of Executive Discretion." One of the marked characteristics of the Anglo-American governmental system, he pointed out, has been the subjection of executive discretion to judicial control. The tendency of late years has, however, been toward recognizing greater independence on the part of executive and administrative officers; and this tendency is evidenced and recognized by many decisions of the highest courts. Mr. Goodnow devoted his address mainly to the discussion of the reasons for this departure from principles once deemed fundamental, and for the resulting approach of our law toward that of Continental Europe in this particular. He found the cause in those social and economic changes which have transformed the United States, since our constitutions were first adopted, from a country marked by the conditions of a simple rural life into one characterized by the complex urban and industrial life of the modern day. Under the former circumstances great reliance could safely be placed in individual effort; present conditions demand a great increase of effective social control. Immediate action, necessary to effective social control, requires the increase of executive discretion, at the expense of judicial control. The extension of the sphere of executive discretion is not to be deplored as a departure from the faith of the fathers, but rather to be accepted as evidence that we are conscious of changing social conditions and are striving to bring our law into harmony therewith. But this extension, it was pointed out, requires increased regard to character and efficiency in the choice of administrative officials, that they may occupy a position similar to that which by universal consent has been accorded to those occupied with the administration of justice.

The theme of Professor McMaster's presidential address was "Old Standards of Public Morals." Its text will be found on a later page of the present number of this journal (pp. 515 *et seqq.*).

Wednesday morning's session was devoted to the reading of papers in American, and largely in Southern, history. Professor St. George L. Sioussat of the University of the South read the first paper, entitled "Virginia and the English Colonial System, 1730-1735." Mr. Sioussat laid stress upon the close relation between the history of the colonies and that of Great Britain, and as an illustration of the effect of that relation upon the colonial system

discussed Walpole's bill for placing an excise upon tobacco. This bill was introduced by the ministry as a means of relieving the Virginia planters. The characteristic economy of Virginia gave rather the appearance than the substance of wealth. The planters were much in debt to English merchants; the illegal trade gave to many an unfair advantage; over-production, especially of poor tobacco, was another evil. Successful regulation of the quantity and quality of the crop could not be effected without co-operation on the part of Maryland. What Virginia could do to help itself, however, it did; the act of 1730 provided for inspection, inflicted penalties for illegal shipping, and supplied a system of tobacco-notes. This was not sufficient, however. A report of the legislature printed at Williamsburg in 1732, entitled *The Case of the Planters of Tobacco*, protested against the practices of English merchants and urged among other remedies the levying of an excise tax upon tobacco. Its proposals were embodied by Walpole in the excise bill which he laid before Parliament; this bill provided for the removal of the customs-duties, substituting an internal revenue tax on tobacco in royal warehouses. The opposition, led by the representatives of the London merchants, charged that the representation of the Virginia legislature had been procured by the ministry. Whether this was the case or not is not known. Parliament was prorogued before the bill was passed, but the fact that a bill had been introduced ostensibly emanating from the legislature of Virginia at least revealed a willingness on the part of the ministry to give ear to the colonial grievances against the London merchants.

Professor Charles Lee Raper of the University of North Carolina read a brief address on the subject, "Why North Carolina at First Refused to Ratify the Federal Constitution." He explained the grounds of objection as lying in the centralized form of the new instrument; the power which it gave to the federal government over elections, taxes, and justice; and the extent to which its provisions ran counter to those notions of popular sovereignty and freedom of self-government which North-Carolinians had long been accustomed to regard as fundamental, and to the individualism of their character.

The third paper of the session was by Professor W. A. Dunning of Columbia University: "The Second Birth of the Republican Party." Despite the popular conception the serious student cannot agree that the Republican party has had an unbroken existence of fifty years. When in 1860 the Republican party won its first great national victory, it was heterogeneous, agreed only on slavery. Party lines, at first broken up by the war, reappeared after a year



of fighting and the employment of war powers by the administration. The supporters of the administration avoided resort to the name and traditions of the Republican party, while its opponents called themselves Democrats. It became necessary to form a new party, whose platform should be the maintenance of the Union. The Union party, formed at the Baltimore convention of 1864, had no continuity with the old Republican party. It was composed of all parties, but was more than a temporary fusion; it was distinctly a new party. The Democrats, however, resenting the appropriation of the name Union by their opponents, insisted on calling them Republicans, and in some local organizations the old title was retained. These connections were merely nominal, however. It was the Union party that was victorious in 1864, and secured the successful conclusion of the war and the abolition of slavery by constitutional amendment. Unprepared for Reconstruction, however, the new party soon developed a line of cleavage, and appeared divided into conservatives and radicals; the latter, at first in the minority, profited by Johnson's lack of tact, and by 1866 controlled the party machinery. Adopting negro suffrage as a national issue, the radical element won a striking victory in the elections, and the movement to nationalize the Union party along conservative lines failed. The conservatives went into the Democratic party, or joined the radicals, thus modifying somewhat their extreme tendencies. The term Republican came again into use; in 1868 the title National Union Republican party was adopted; in 1872 the word Union was dropped and a continuity of existence from 1860 was claimed.

The final paper, by Professor R. C. H. Catterall of Cornell University, "A French Diplomat and the Treaty with Spain, 1819," was a study of the part played by Hyde de Neuville, minister of France at Washington, in securing a peaceful settlement of the disputed issues between the United States and Spain. It is well known that such a solution was not expected by John Quincy Adams; the Spanish-American revolt, the determination of the United States to secure Florida, and the dead-lock over the Louisiana boundary all combined to make a resort to arms most probable. Hyde de Neuville was instructed to use his efforts to maintain peace; he realized that his course was to persuade Spain to yield the Floridas for what she could get in the settlement of the Louisiana boundary. His first opportunity to prevent war came in the fall of 1817, when he supported Adams in his opposition to Monroe's desire to recognize Buenos Ayres. When in January of the next year Great Britain's offer of her services in negotiating the cession of Florida was declined by the United States, Hyde took the matter up with

the Spanish minister; finding that Spain was willing to cede the Floridas, he urged an accommodation of the Louisiana boundary. Jackson's seizure of Pensacola gave him an opportunity of direct intervention. Adams refused to disavow Jackson's act, and desired the French minister to secure a proposal from Spain; this he did, and then, acting as mediator, continued the negotiation until a compromise had been effected. It is safe to say that without the services of Hyde de Neuville the treaty of 1819 could not have been secured.

The afternoon of Wednesday (there was no session in the evening) was given up to conferences and sessions of committees. Of the two conferences, the more numerously attended was that on History in Elementary Schools, while the other was occupied with topics in Church History. In the former the proceedings consisted of the reading of a preliminary and partial report of the Committee of Eight, appointed a year ago to consider a course of history for elementary schools, and of a discussion based upon the report. Both report and discussion were limited to a consideration of the work of the last four years of the grammar grades.

The chairman of the meeting, Professor James A. James of Northwestern University, chairman of the Committee of Eight, traced the steps leading to the appointment of that committee, noting the reports on history in elementary schools presented in the Madison Conference of 1892, and Miss Salmon's report on the same subject in the second appendix to the *Report of the Committee of Seven*. The programmes of historical courses in elementary schools presented in these two reports are the only ones hitherto drawn up by national organizations.

In presenting the formal report for the committee, Professor Henry E. Bourne of Western Reserve University said that historical instruction in the grammar grades should bear exclusively upon American history. The subject-matter should be subdivided into periods and treated in chronological order. Our conception of the scope of American history is by no means to be confined to the period after 1492 and the territory west of the Atlantic and east of the Pacific. It as truly includes a history of European events as does that of any European people. This is true not only of the period of origins but also of the later periods. In brief, the problem of the teacher is to explain the American world, not to tell merely what has happened in America. The chronological order should be followed, since facts lose none of their value by this arrangement, and the present rests upon the past. The fifth grade should be taught the place of exploration and discoveries in the world as

a whole; the sixth grade the story of settlement and growth to 1763; the seventh grade the period of revolution until the Spanish colonies won their freedom and both North and South America were politically independent; the eighth grade the period from about 1820 to 1906.

The work of the fifth grade presents serious but not insuperable problems. In his work in geography and language the child receives ideas of the world. History should strengthen the impressions thus gained; but it has not always done this. Thus in his study of literature he is taught to look upon England as a country to which we owe a great debt, whereas from history he generally receives a different impression.

Professor Bourne then showed in detail how the plan might be carried out. By means of stories, for instance, the children can be given an idea of the various countries of Europe, the characteristic features of their civilization, and their relative importance.

Miss Mabel Hill, of the Lowell Normal School, approved the plan both psychologically and pedagogically. The chronological order is to be commended. The proposed syllabus has a logical sequence and presents a view of history that is without narrowness or prejudice. It is desirable that children should be taught the story not only of the Reformation but of the Counter-Reformation and the work of the Jesuits; the contributions of pagan nations to civilization; the influences, other than human, which have affected the history of the race; and other countries, both geographically and historically, as well as our own.

Mr. Henry Johnson, of the State Normal School of Charleston, Illinois, believed the suggested plan to be practicable, and was pleased by the enlarged conception of American history. But he questioned whether the field should be limited to American history; whether the capacity of the children in the grammar grades was fully understood; and whether there was not an impression that history could not be presented to the children as history. The problem is what kind of history can be brought within the cultivated intelligence of children. As early as the fourth grade, it is possible to arouse an interest in history proper and in questions of historical evidence. The fifth grade can read such documents as the Rule of St. Benedict and Einhard's Life of Charlemagne. The sixth grade had voted Petrarch more interesting than Froissart; the seventh grade can read enough of colonial charters to correct statements in the text-books. Whatever the period and the countries selected by the committee, the report should estab-

lish a definite relation between history in schools and history in histories.

Dr. Tolson of Baltimore, while in general agreement with the report, considered the outline for the fifth grade too comprehensive to be entirely satisfactory, and thought that the course was overcrowded.

In the discussion that followed a number of speakers took part. Dr. James Sullivan of New York City and President Ward of the Western Maryland State Normal School spoke in favor of the report. The chief adverse criticisms were that the course as presented was overcrowded; that it lacked real historical unity; and that teachers in some sections of the country at least were not sufficiently well equipped to make its adoption practicable. Other speakers especially commended the division of the subject-matter. Professor Kling of Nebraska believed that it is customary to underestimate what grammar and high-school pupils can do in weighing historical evidence.

Professor Bourne indorsed story-work because in it English and history go together. History should be fastened to stories already familiar and to geography. As to overcrowding, the proposed course sounded more crowded than it was, but the intention was to give plenty of material for selection.

At the Church History Conference, of which Professor Wiliston Walker of New Haven was chairman, there was an attendance of about thirty, mainly composed of theological instructors and visiting clergymen. The programme, which had been planned to satisfy a variety of interests, was successful in engaging attention and provoking discussion. The conference opened with a paper by Professor A. C. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, on the "Rise of the Modern Conception of Divine Immanence." Although a few of the hearers were tempted to discuss the bearing of the conception on certain doctrines of the Church, the address was a purely historical exposition of the influences co-operating to give dominance to the idea of divine immanence. The factors in the process were presented as Pietism, the growth of the idea of evolution since Leibnitz, Herder's reconception of Spinoza's monism, and the influence of the romantic movement.

The second contribution to the conference was a plea by Dr. J. C. Ayer, jr., of the Philadelphia Divinity School, for a source-book to aid in the teaching of church history. This was an admirable statement of the needs to be met in the actual conditions of church-history classes, and its precise conception of the book desired will be read with interest in the full report of the proceedings.

Professor Ernest C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University, brought before the conference for discussion a statement on the publication of materials for American church history, suggested by the remarks of Professor Shailer Mathews in the conference of the preceding year. Dr. Richardson based his opening remarks on a search, which did not pretend to be exhaustive but was certainly suggestive in its results, for instances in the last five years of the publication of manuscripts of the sort which formed the theme of his paper. He showed that there had been, in books and journals, a not inconsiderable amount of documentary publication; that the Protestant theological seminaries had had very little hand in this, and as for systematic attention to the matter had been doing practically nothing; and that a greater amount of good work, in the way of publication of materials for American church history, was being done by the Catholics and the Jews than by all the Protestant denominations put together. Without attempting to enumerate the materials awaiting publication, he specified their leading classes and by instances exhibited their interest. Next he addressed himself to the question, what could be done. Obviously the theological seminaries are in a better position to do work of this sort than any other existing agencies. They can work through their graduates to gather materials, can sometimes utilize their postgraduate students for editing, can in some cases use their journals as organs of publication, and through their financial agents can easily secure funds for so plainly appropriate a line of endeavor. Taking up the question how the seminaries shall be stirred up to this task, and how induced to persevere in it, the speaker laid the responsibility on the American Historical Association, as heir of the American Society of Church History; and suggested organic provisions in its system whereby it could accomplish the work. It may be mentioned that, pending such action, the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution has undertaken, in a manner described on a later page, to lay the necessary foundation for such activity in documentary publication, by whatever agency attempted. It is hoped that it will thereby afford a strong stimulus toward its inception.

The exercises of Thursday morning, like those of Wednesday afternoon, consisted of two conferences, in this case occupied respectively with History in the College Curriculum and with the Problems of State and Local Historical Societies. In opening the former, its chairman, Professor Charles H. Haskins of Harvard University, said that, of all the questions that concern the college teacher of history, none is of greater importance than that of the first year of college work. Its importance is recent; for when history was in-

troduced into the college curriculum, twenty or twenty-five years ago, it came in at the top and slowly worked down into the sophomore and freshman years. With this change in the position of history in the curriculum, new problems arise, for the younger student has to be taught college methods of work; college teaching is brought into relation with the teaching of history in schools; and the problem of handling larger classes has also to be met. Various conditions in the different colleges give rise to different problems. Since the matter is still largely in the experimental stage, it has seemed desirable that teachers representing different types of colleges and of methods should come together to exchange experiences.

The introductory course in history at Harvard is mainly taken by freshmen; it deals with the Middle Ages and primarily with the Continent. The lectures aim at explaining, connecting, enlarging, and vitalizing the facts gained from the prescribed reading. The reading is in weekly instalments of from seventy-five to one hundred pages; and is tested in the weekly meetings of the sections, where there are brief papers, discussions, and map exercises. At regular intervals each student also meets his assistant for individual conference. Source-books are regularly used.

Professor O. H. Richardson described the introductory course at Yale, which gives a general survey of Continental European history from the fall of Rome to 1870. The class is divided into sections of less than forty. A syllabus forms the basis of the work, and there are daily quizzes, short written tests at least once a week, and examinations of students' note-books. An important and successful feature of the work is the training in knowledge of books which comes through bibliographical exercises, directed through personal interviews. Collateral reading in compendiums and standard works is carried on throughout the year; the majority of the instructors believe that the source-method is available to only a small extent in a course of this kind.

In the absence of Miss Salmon, the paper that she had prepared was read by Miss Ellery of Vassar College. The purpose of the first year's work in history at Vassar is to teach the technique of the subject by giving students a knowledge of books on the mechanical side, and showing them how to get at historical material and present it; to teach them how to think historically by giving them a bird's-eye view of the history of Western Europe from the fall of Rome, and an idea of historical perspective and of the unity of history; and to arouse an interest in the subject. There are personal conferences and illustrated lectures. The class is divided into sections of twenty-five students each. Formal lectures and formal essays are avoided.

The effort is to make the student independent and to create a basis for the later elective work.

Professor Frank M. Anderson of the University of Minnesota brought out the point that the character of the first year's course should be determined by the preparation of the students; and that there ought to be two or more courses to meet different needs, so that preparatory work would receive the recognition that it ought to receive. At Minnesota two courses are offered: one (13 B. C.-1500 A. D.) for those who have previously had one year of history or less; the other on English constitutional history for those who have had two years or more. No broader field should be traversed. The day of the old general course in history is ended in the high-schools and should be ended in the colleges. All or a large part of the work should be done in small classes. In the first course strong emphasis should be laid on training and preparation for more advanced courses; and documents should be critically studied as evidence.

Mr. Hiram Bingham explained how the preceptorial system recently introduced into the methods of instruction at Princeton had been applied to the teaching of history. The plan, which required an increase of one-half in the teaching force, aims to bring the student into sympathetic personal contact with the preceptor. Each course is conducted by a professor who lectures twice a week; and in addition there are small conferences held two or three times weekly at which four or five men meet and report to their preceptor. What the average undergraduate needs is more reading, and to be kept at work by a live discussion of what is read. The relations with the preceptor are those of friendship. The preceptor can debar any man from taking an examination but gives no mark. The system is flexible and adaptable. The preceptor is not a coach, nor a quiz-master. He should see that the student has been working, but chiefly he should make it his endeavor to arouse and establish a strong and healthy interest in intellectual matters.

Professor Fling of the University of Nebraska spoke of the distinguishing characteristics of the work there, especially in the department of European history. Much emphasis is laid on method-work. In the first year, the attempt is made to teach the method by which historical truth is arrived at, since the man is not a scholar who knows results but does not know how the knowledge is obtained.

Professor Morse Stephens deprecated the attack on the formal lecture; its excellence or lack of it depends on the lecturer. The more formal and careful the lecture is, the better. Perhaps the most

important work is with the freshmen, and the most experienced professors should have charge of this work. The attack upon the system of having all the men together in one class was also deprecated. In the large courses students come to know their classmates; they can be taught a point of view, not facts. A stimulation comes from being in a crowd; clergymen do not divide their congregations into sections. But section-work should be used as a supplement. English history is perhaps the best to begin with; although the students do not learn much about English history, they deal with various kinds of historical material, and learn to know the documents and the different sources of authority. What we have to do with the freshmen mainly is to expel the school-boy and give the freshman the nature of the thinking man. It matters little what subject is taught—the end is the same.

Professor Farrand of Leland Stanford University said that students at that institution are given a practical library course: combined with this is work on simple problems of historical criticism, which is at first confined to text-books. Professor Fay of Dartmouth College spoke in favor of the syllabus as an aid in keeping the various sections together in their work. Professor Trenholme of the University of Missouri believed in the formal lecture if the lecturer were worth hearing. If the lecture did not prove attractive, class discussion might well take its place. There is danger of making the teacher of history too mechanical through the elaboration of machinery. Other speakers were Dr. Fite of Harvard, Mrs. Abbe of New York, Dr. Sullivan of the New York Commercial High School, Professor Brown of New York University, and Dr. Shepherd of Baltimore.

In summing up the results of the conference, Professor Haskins called attention to the very slight emphasis that had been placed upon the subject studied. The matter of greater interest was that pupils should learn something about studying history. But the subject chosen must be neither too large, nor too small. As to how students should be introduced to the subject, the speakers were not in agreement; but students vary greatly in preparation and ability, and the course must be adaptable so that it will hit all, and so that the better students may be encouraged to do more than the others. The net result of the conference is that we must get the interest of the students and teach them how to study. Ways must differ, and fields of study must differ.

The fourth of the conferences, which occurred at the same time with the one last mentioned, was devoted to the Problems of State and Local Historical Societies. Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh



of the State University of Iowa presided; Mr. Frank H. Severance of the Buffalo Historical Society acted as secretary. Problems of co-operation were first considered. Mr. William O. Scroggs of Cambridge, Mass., read a paper on the relation of the college chair or department of American history to the work of historical societies. He had sent out systematic inquiries as to these relations, intended to collect information from the societies as to the aid which they rendered to the work of instruction in the neighboring colleges, as to contributions by professors and college students to the proceedings of the societies, as to assistance by them in the editing of publications, and as to definite efforts to recruit the membership of the societies from among the collegians. The result of the inquiries was to show the existence of little more than relations of general friendliness, though these took a wide variety of forms. The speaker urged the maintenance of a broader view on the part of the societies, and more serious efforts to enlist the members of colleges and universities in their work.

Another phase of co-operative activity was illustrated in a paper on the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies by Mr. S. P. Heilman of Heilman Dale, secretary of the federation. There are thirty-six historical societies in the state. An act of the legislature allows the county commissioners of each county to appropriate two hundred dollars to the county historical society, but hardly a third of the counties in the state have such organizations. The Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies was formed at Harrisburg on January 5, 1905, with a view to encouraging the formation of local historical societies, to promoting research into Pennsylvania history, to the preparation of check-lists for a complete bibliography of the commonwealth by a combination of local or county bibliographies, to mutual communication of information as to what each society is doing, and to the keeping of lists of historical workers. The federation began with thirteen of the historical societies of the state, but now embraces twenty-three. Two counties, Lancaster and Tioga, have made lists of all publications printed within their territory. The meeting of January 4, 1906, will better define the possible scope of such a federation; and obviously in the extension of such a system to other states regard would need to be paid to the great variety exhibited in the organization of American historical societies and particularly in their relations to the state governments.

On behalf of a subcommittee of the General Committee, appointed a year ago to make a systematic report on the organization and methods of work appropriate to or employed by state and local historical societies—a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Reuben G.

Thwaites of Wisconsin, Professor Shambaugh of Iowa, and Professor Franklin L. Riley of the University of Mississippi, Dr. Thwaites presented parts of their report, the whole of which is to be printed in the *Annual Report* of the Association. The questionnaires which were sent out by the subcommittee asked the societies to report as to their date of organization, the number of their members, the value of their buildings, the amount of their income and of their endowments, and the number of volumes contained in their libraries. It proved difficult to obtain information from some of the societies, especially in the East. Replies had, however, been received from nineteen national, eight sectional, sixty-two state, and one hundred and six local societies. (It is understood that there are somewhat more than four hundred historical societies in the United States.) The inquiries extended to societies privately endowed or sustained by the dues of members, to state historical departments and commissions, to the relations of these to the societies, and to the various forms of organization prevalent in both sorts of institutions.

Dr. Thwaites discussed to some extent the relative merits of the Alabama plan, somewhat too sweepingly commended by the Association last year; of the plan followed in Wisconsin, namely, resting on a state society; and of the compromise adopted in Iowa, which combines features of the departmental and of the societary régime. His report also entered into the relations of the societies to the state universities, and the functions of the former with respect to publication and research. In the latter particular he urged better printing and especially better editing. It was mentioned that the State Historical Society of Wisconsin expected to have ready in about a month an index to its manuscript materials, and that this publication would embrace information regarding historical manuscript material to be found elsewhere in the Upper Mississippi Basin.

Professor U. B. Phillips of the University of Wisconsin spoke briefly on documentary collections in the old states of the South. He went over in general terms the material possessed by the Georgia Historical Society and various private holders in Georgia, that possessed by the state of South Carolina at Columbia, and the rich colonial material at Charleston, instancing particularly the remarkable set of newspapers at the Charleston Library, the interesting plantation records of St. John's Berkeley, and the numerous collections of pamphlets within the state. He dealt similarly with the chief repositories in Virginia, and dwelt on some of the encouraging features in the present situation with respect to historical material in the South. He especially urged the paying of proper attention

to the collection and preservation of first-hand material for the industrial history of that section.

Mr. Dunbar Rowland, archivist of Mississippi, described the Spanish archives of the Natchez district. These are the records of the Spanish occupation, covering the years 1781-1798. They are bound in forty-one volumes and consist of royal orders and decrees, proclamations, papers emanating from the governor-general at New Orleans and the local governor and military commander, legal papers, such as court proceedings, depositions, wills, deeds, etc., and a quantity of letters. They were recently rediscovered in the office of the chancery clerk of Adams County, where they had remained for nearly a century, and have been temporarily transferred to the Department of Archives and History at Jackson, where they are being copied.

The discussion which followed these papers was participated in by the chairman of the meeting, by Mr. J. Alston Cabell of Richmond, Virginia, speaking on behalf of such organizations as the Virginia Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, and by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The latter dwelt especially on the desire of his department to be useful to state and local historical societies and to promote co-operation among them. As one step in this direction, it has undertaken the preparation of lists of documents from European archives, relating to American history, which have been printed or of which transcripts exist in the United States. These, especially in the case of the French and Spanish documents, will help to keep societies, especially those of the West, from duplicating each other's work in the printing of material or the procuring of transcripts.

The business meeting of the Association, held on Thursday afternoon, was preceded by the reading of a paper on Avalon and the Colonial Projects of George Calvert. The mingling of historical papers and the transactions of the business meeting is a doubtful innovation; but the fact that the paper was read in the rooms of the Maryland Historical Society made it possible to enhance its interest by the exhibition of original documents illustrating the story. The writer, Professor Bernard C. Steiner of Johns Hopkins University, related Calvert's early history, described the purchase of Avalon, narrated the subsequent history of the unfortunate experiment, and set forth the relation it bore to Calvert's greater and more fruitful endeavors in the foundation of the province of Maryland.

It seems most suitable to defer till the close of this article the

narrative of the business meeting, and to proceed with the literary exercises till their termination.

The fifth session was held on Thursday evening and was devoted to European history. Professor E. P. Cheyney read a paper on the England of our Earliest American Forefathers, treating of the lacunae in our knowledge of the period and of the opportunities for further investigation. The period of English history that is of most significance to Americans is the period from 1580 to 1660, which covered the adult life of the whole body of early emigrants, the transplanters to America of English institutions. No detailed history of England covers this period, or if any, it is to deal mainly with its contentions. But when the dissatisfied element left England they left these disputes behind them, and took with them the practical capacity to govern. It is the regular forms of regular government that we need to know about, and especially the forms of local government. Again, neither the organization and personnel of the Church of England nor the social history of the time has been dealt with adequately. The existence or non-existence of historical works depends upon the documents available. The history of local political institutions could be studied from material already in print, though much of it is widely scattered. The fine body of national records in the Public Record Office is mostly classified, and full calendars of the State Papers to the number of some three hundred volumes are in print. But three or four volumes for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are issued for one volume of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; pressure should be brought to bear upon the authorities of the Record Office to print the calendars for these later centuries. Professor Cheyney's paper, mainly a plea for a more methodical, scholarly, and detailed study of the period from 1580 to 1660, with exposition of the means, may be expected to appear in a modified form in the July number of the *Review*.

Colonel W. R. Livermore explained his project of a new historical atlas of Europe, and exhibited a considerable number of his maps. The main peculiarity of this atlas is that, except in the ancient period, it presents a map for every decade.

The third topic treated at this session was Recent Tendencies in the Study of the French Revolution. Professor J. H. Robinson of Columbia University read the paper, which was afterward discussed by Professor H. Morse Stephens and Professor F. M. Fling. Professor Robinson's paper appears in this number of the *Review*.

Professor Morse Stephens said that in times past he had exaggerated enormously the importance of the French Revolution, which closed an old epoch rather than opened a new. Napoleon was the

last in the series of the enlightened despots of the eighteenth century. If Europe be studied as a whole, as it should be, the French Revolution is seen to be an episode in which some things were done in France that had already been done in other countries by great rulers. There was not a single completed reform of the period of the French Revolution which was not completed in some other country first.

Professor Fling, while believing that much that Professor Stephens had said was true, thought that it was not the whole truth, and that the French Revolution was not a simple imitation. The work of the last fifteen or twenty years marks an era in the study of the French Revolution. Aulard and others realized that the foundation for the study of the French Revolution was not laid. Thorough monographic work must be done and this is just being begun. The old school did not know what thorough investigation means. Aulard is on the dividing line. Young men of the new school are now doing monographic work like that done in the history of Greece and Rome and the Middle Ages. The revolutionary movement in the provinces is being related to the rest of the movement. The French have displaced the Germans in the historical world and now hold the primacy.

The papers of the last session, held on Friday afternoon at Washington, were read in one of the rooms of the Library of Congress. In a neighboring room Mr. Worthington C. Ford, chief of the Division of Manuscripts, had arranged a most interesting exhibition of historical documents, of great variety and often of the utmost individual significance, selected from the rich stores which are now in his custody and to which he is making such striking and numerous additions.

Before the reading of formal papers Professor Morse Stephens gave an interesting account of the H. H. Bancroft Library of printed and manuscript material, of its acquisition by the University of California, and of the value which it will have for the state and the university.

Dr. James Schouler's paper on the Authorship of the Monroe Doctrine was a defense of President Monroe personally against recent disparaging statements which ascribe the true authorship and inspiration to John Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State. Adams himself made no such claim, and the evidence adduced from his posthumous drafts fails to establish it. On the contrary, President Monroe, though slow and patient in reaching conclusions, was in all respects a wise, capable, and far-sighted executive and took courageously all the responsibilities of his long

and eventful administration. Even supposing that phrases in his message of 1823 were suggested by others, he should have the just credit of flinging the bold challenge to Europe upon his executive responsibility.

Dr. Schouler examined Monroe's published correspondence for 1823 in connection with Adams's Diary, to show that he took here his own initiative and pursued it so as to defeat the schemes of the Holy Alliance. Before Rush's famous despatches arrived he is seen in this correspondence meditating a new pronouncement for American liberty. These despatches, when received, he promptly submitted to Ex-Presidents Jefferson and Madison for advice, before consulting his cabinet; and in Jefferson's famous reply the whole scheme of what we call the Monroe Doctrine is fully set forth by suggestion.

Monroe dealt with the projected European invasion as thus advised, except, as he explained to Jefferson in December, that he considered it more conciliatory to the Allies and more effective for our own country to make the warning pronouncement in his message to Congress, instead of concerting a joint protest with Canning and Great Britain. This master-stroke in dealing with the crisis appears to have been Monroe's own idea; and it was the stand itself against foreign interference in this continent, rather than the mere phrasing of the message, which impressed Europe and baffled the intended invasion.

Mr. William R. Thayer of Cambridge, Massachusetts, read a paper entitled "American Holidays in their Relation to American History". Adverting to the importance which holidays may have as emphasizing events of structural importance, and to the use that may be made of them in stimulating enlightened patriotism, he suggested a more systematic series than is now employed by most states. Liberty, independence, and union ought all alike to be commemorated, not independence alone. April 19, now celebrated in Massachusetts, should be called Liberty Day. May 30 should be the holiday of Union, our feast of patriotism February 22. October 12 should be added as Columbus Day. Ascribing to the Pilgrims the establishment of religious freedom and tolerance, Mr. Thayer advocated the use of Thanksgiving to commemorate those blessings, while the *entente cordiale* of the English and American nations might be symbolized by making a holiday of February 12, the birthday, in 1809, of both Lincoln and Darwin.

Dr. James K. Hosmer's paper on the Theatre and the Combatants of the Civil War was a summary of the conditions under which the war was waged, and a brief statement of the relative

strength, qualitative as well as quantitative, of the two sides. He defined the area of the war, described its relations to the Appalachians, and showed how the unusually diversified character of the territory involved gave opportunity for every possible kind of warfare and taxed the resources of commanders to their utmost. The differences in number of population, degree of homogeneity, and industrial character were next adverted upon; then the relations of slave labor to military resources in the South, and the compensating of its smaller numbers by greater initial military efficiency.

Finally, Mr. William Garrott Brown read a paper on Personal Force in American History. Passing in review the great names of our last hundred and thirty years, he showed how widely in many instances the popular estimate of them differs from that put forward by the closet historian. Though there is a large illogical element in the remembrance which the mass entertains for its great men, so that the one is taken and the other left, he urged that at least one element in greatness is the power to seize upon the affections of living men and to impress their imaginations. The abiding multitude repeats largely the estimates formed by the shifting multitude of the day. While there may be no principle or formula to explain the wide divergence of popular fame from historical repute among the intellectual, yet we may be warranted in suspecting that popular fame should be more fully taken into account, and that from it suggestions may be derived which shall help toward broader estimates of the great, and toward more catholic standards of greatness.

No member could have sat through the business meeting of Thursday afternoon without being deeply impressed by the multi-fold activities of the society, the energy and fidelity with which they are being prosecuted, and the great amount which the Association is accomplishing for the cause of history. The first document read was the report of the Executive Council. It appeared that appropriations of about the usual amount had been made to the work of the various agencies of the Association. The Council also reported that it approved of the continuance of the conference on the work of state and local historical societies, and had appointed as its chairman and secretary for the ensuing year Professor Shambaugh and Mr. Severance respectively.

The treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, was unable to be present; this is believed to have been the first meeting that he has missed since the organization of the Association in 1884. His report showed the usual increase in material prosperity. The receipts for the year had been rather more than \$8,000, the expendi-

tures somewhat less than \$7,300. The assets of the society had increased by \$757, and now stood at the handsome figure of \$23,235. The secretary reported that the total enrolled membership was 2,394, and that 125 other persons had been duly nominated and elected, but had not yet qualified.

Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, reported that the expected volume of the Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, to be edited by Professor George P. Garrison, would hardly be ready for insertion in the *Annual Report* for 1905. It may be expected that these papers will appear in the next report, that of 1906. In response to various requests for some sort of code of rules or suggestions for the printing of manuscript materials for American history, which might help inexperienced editors and aid in producing a greater degree of uniformity, the Commission presented (and has since printed for separate distribution) a body of simple rules of this sort. Professor Bourne feeling unable to continue as chairman of this Commission, a reorganization was effected. The chairmanship passes to Professor Jameson, who held it during the first four years of the Commission's existence. Such work as it has done in the way of collecting information respecting manuscript historical materials in private hands can now be appropriately carried on, indeed is being continuously carried on, by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution, especially by Mr. Waldo G. Leland. In respect to documentary publication the Commission's activity will hereafter (after the issue of the Texan volume) be confined to dealing with materials of national, not local, scope, which are in private hands, are unlikely to be transferred to well-appointed public repositories, and are therefore subjected to the chance of destruction. Thus it takes to itself a definite field, not occupied by other existing agencies of publication.

The Public Archives Commission reported that the forthcoming volume of the Association would include reports on the archives of Michigan and Wisconsin, on the French archives of Illinois, supplementary information on the local records of Georgia, and something on the state archive commissions. The Commission will probably hereafter print an annual bibliographical list of record publications. Investigations of the archives of Arkansas, Florida, Minnesota, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia are under way. A subcommittee, consisting of Professors C. M. Andrews and H. L. Osgood, has been entrusted by the Librarian of Congress with the function of advising with respect to the transcripts from English archives which are being made for



the Library of Congress. Some twenty-three volumes have already been copied in whole or in part thus far from the British Museum and the Bodleian Library.

The committee on the Justin Winsor Prize reported that no essay submitted for the competition this year was of sufficient excellence to justify the award of the prize. The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize (now first awarded, for an essay in European history) reported that the prize had been awarded to Mr. David S. Muzzey for his essay on the Spiritual Franciscans, with honorable mention of the essay of Miss Eloise Ellery on Jean Pierre Brissot.

The chairman of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW reported that Professor H. Morse Stephens, a member of the Board from the foundation of the journal, whose term now expired, declined re-election. His services to the journal were spoken of with appreciation. It was announced that the Council had elected as his successor Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University. Professor Adams also reported that the index-volume to Volumes I.-X. would be ready this spring; and that arrangements had been made with the publishers of the REVIEW by which the cost per member to the Association had been reduced from \$2.00 to \$1.60 per annum.

For the Committee on Bibliography, Professor E. C. Richardson reported as ready for publication a reissue of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *Bibliography of American Historical Societies*, brought down to date. The committee has made large progress in the preparation of its list of source-publications and the libraries where they are to be found. The General Committee reported an effort to extend membership among libraries, and the preparation of a report on the special lines of research in which individual members are interested. The subcommittee charged with the making of a report on the work of state and local historical societies reported briefly through its chairman. Professor Stephens reported for the Pacific Coast Branch, describing its recent annual meeting and announcing another to take place next Thanksgiving at Portland. Mr. Jameson, editor of the series of Original Narratives of Early American History, explained in some detail the plan of the reprints and the arrangements already made for the opening volumes.

The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools, Professor J. A. James of Northwestern University chairman, reported briefly on its meetings and work during the past year, its organization into subcommittees (on courses, methods and materials, European experience, the training of the teacher, etc.), and on its

plans for continuing the preparation of its report and for securing discussion of its recommendations by the various associations of teachers of history throughout the country.

Complimentary resolutions of the usual character were presented and passed. The committee on nominations, Professors G. L. Burr, C. D. Hazen, and J. H. Latané, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Judge Simeon E. Baldwin was elected president, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson first vice-president, and Professor George B. Adams second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor C. H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to their former positions. In the place of Professors Burr and Cheyney, who had been thrice elected to the Executive Council, Professors Charles M. Andrews and James H. Robinson were chosen. The place of meeting for December, 1906, is Providence.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, New Haven.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	J. Franklin Jameson, Washington.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor George B. Adams, New Haven.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton St., New York.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers) :

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Goldwin Smith, <sup>1</sup>
President James Burrill Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Professor John Bach McMaster, <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor Edward G. Bourne,
James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor A. C. McLaughlin,
Professor George Park Fisher, <sup>1</sup>	Professor George P. Garrison,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor Charles M. Andrews,
Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Professor James H. Robinson.
Henry Charles Lea, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	

*Committees:*

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-second Annual Meeting:* Professor Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, chairman; Professors William E. Dodd, Max Farrand, William MacDonald, and Williston Walker, and George P. Winship, Esq.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-president.

*Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, and the American Political Science Association:* William B. Weedon, Esq., Providence, chairman; Professors Henry B. Gardner, William MacDonald, and George G. Wilson (with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Twenty-second Meeting:* Mrs. ———, Providence, chairman; Miss Ida M. Tarbell (with power to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Professor George B. Adams, Yale University, chairman; Professors George L. Burr, Albert Bushnell Hart, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin, and William M. Sloane.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution of Washington, chairman; Professors Edward G. Bourne and Frederick W. Moore, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Worthington C. Ford, Esq., and Thomas M. Owen, Esq.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, chairman; Professor Edward P. Cheyney, Roger Foster, Esq., Professors Williston Walker and Evarts B. Greene.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Professors William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, and Edwin E. Sparks, Dunbar Rowland, Esq., and Robert T. Swan, Esq.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; A. P. C. Griffin, Esq., William C. Lane, Esq., J. N. Larned, Esq., Professors W. H. Siebert and Frederick J. Turner.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor Earle W. Dow, University of Michigan, chairman; Professor Charles H. Haskins, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professors Fred M. Fling, Samuel M. Jackson, Elizabeth K. Kendall, Anson D. Morse, and Charles D. Hazen.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman; Professors George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, John M. Vincent, and James W. Thompson.

*General Committee:* Professor Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, chairman; Professors Charles H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, Lilian W. Johnson, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, Frank H. Hodder, Franklin L. Riley, Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor Frederick G. Young (with power to add adjunct members).

*Finance Committee:* James H. Eckels, Esq., Chicago, chairman, and Peter White, Esq.

*Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools:* Professor J. A. James, Northwestern University, chairman; Superintendents E. C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, and J. H. Van Sickle, Professors Julius Sachs, Henry E. Bourne, and Henry W. Thurston, and Miss Mabel Hill.

## OLD STANDARDS OF PUBLIC MORALS.<sup>1</sup>

WHOEVER reads the book-lists of publishers, whoever glances over the titles of new books displayed on the counters of the book-shops, must surely have remarked the extraordinary activity shown in recent years by writers on American history. Essays, travels, monographs, biographies of our great men of every sort from frontiersmen to presidents, histories of our country in many volumes, histories of the states, and scores of books on particular phases of our national life, have come from the press year after year in a steadily increasing quantity. It should seem at first sight as if every nook and corner of the broad domain of history must have been by this time fully explored. But a sifting of the output for ten years past leaves no doubt that back of much of this activity is pure commercialism; that some of it is, after all, but a new threshing of the old straw; and that but little of it can be said to be inspired by a sincere desire to do better what has been done before. Meantime great fields of history have been left untilled. No writer has as yet thought it worth while to enrich our literature with an impartial, well-told story of the rise and fall of political parties. Much has been written concerning the political and still more concerning the military events of the great struggle for independence. But where shall we turn for a narrative of the doings and the sufferings of the people during that long period of strife and revolution? No feature of our national existence is more fascinating than the westward movement of population, the great march across the continent. Yet we have no history of this migration—no account of the causes which led to it; of the paths along which the people moved; of the economic conditions which now accelerated, now retarded it; of the founding of great states; of the ever-changing life on the frontier as the frontier was pushed steadily westward over the Alleghenies, across the valley of the Mississippi, and over the plains to disappear in our own day at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. We still wait for a history of the Continental Congress; for the man who shall compress within the limits of a single volume the history of our national life; for the man who within a like space shall tell the marvellous story of our economic and industrial development; and

<sup>1</sup> The President's address to the American Historical Association, December 26, 1905.

for the man who shall do for American what Mr. Lecky has so well done for European morals.

Such a work would indeed be an addition to our historical literature, and not the least interesting part of it would be that devoted to the study of public morals. The code of public morality which has at any time really been lived up to, in our country, is a great help to the understanding of the social and political conditions of that time. The sort of men who find their way into public life; the kind of government which prevails at any time or in any place; the acts done by Congresses, legislatures, city councils, municipal bodies of any sort, are just such as the mass of the people are content to have and often insist on having. What has been the conduct of the people when called on to meet great issues, where expediency, profit, prosperity stood on the one hand, and some principle of public morality on the other hand, is therefore very properly a part of our history, and sheds a flood of light on the phases of life which it is the duty of the historian to record.

Of struggles of this sort the annals of our country furnish many signal instances. When the Continental Congress which gathered at Philadelphia in May of 1775 found itself forced to assume the conduct of a war with the mother-country, it sought to pay expenses by an issue of bills of credit. The fatal step once taken, other issues followed fast and followed faster till depreciation brought the bills so low that to print one cost more than it was worth. On the faces of them were no solemn promises that they should ever be redeemed at any time or place. "This bill", so ran the wording, "entitles the bearer to receive two Spanish milled dollars, or the value thereof in gold or silver, according to the resolution of the Congress held at Philadelphia on the tenth of May 1775." But that the bills should be redeemed at some time and place was the plain intent and expectation of both the Congress and the people. To doubt this intent, to deny that the Congress money was as good as gold, to refuse to take it at par, to refuse to take it at all, was rank toryism. For so doing scores of men were dragged before committees of safety, were reported to provincial congresses, were advertised as enemies of their country, were forced to submit under threats of imprisonment, and were stripped of their property without due process of law.

In the dark days when the British were marching across the Jerseys, when the fate of the rebellious colonies seemed trembling in the balance, Putnam put forth a proclamation warning the people of Philadelphia that if any man refused to sell his goods for continental money, the goods should be seized and the offender cast into prison; Congress called on the Council of Safety for help, and the

Council decreed that any man who would not take the Congress money should forfeit the goods for which the bills were offered, or cancel the debt for which the bills were tendered and pay a fine of five pounds Pennsylvania money.

Congress meantime had again and again solemnly promised that the bills should be redeemed. On June 22, 1775, it was resolved, "That the twelve confederated colonies be pledged for the redemption of the bills of credit"; on December 26, 1775, it was resolved, "That the thirteen United Colonies be pledged for the redemption of the bills of credit"; and after independence was declared each issue was made "on the faith of the United States", and the faith of the thirteen states was pledged for its redemption. When repeated issues had set afloat more than a hundred million dollars in paper, and men began to whisper that Congress never could and never would redeem it, Congress, on December 29, 1778, vigorously denied the imputation.

Whereas [said the resolution] a report hath circulated in divers parts of America that Congress would not redeem the bills of credit issued by them to defray the expences of the war, but would suffer them to sink in the hands of the holder, whereby the value of the said bills hath, in the opinion of many of the good people of these states, depreciated; and least the silence of Congress might give strength to the said report; Resolved, That the said report is false and derogatory to the honour of Congress.

But the report, unhappily, did not cease to circulate, and in September of 1779 Congress found it necessary to make its good name and credit the subject of a long and elaborate address to the people. In the course of it three questions were discussed: Has the faith of the United States been pledged for redemption of the bills? Are the United States in a condition to redeem them? Is there any reason to apprehend a wanton violation of public faith? In answer to this last question the language of Congress was most vigorous. From the enemy, it was said, had come the

notable discovery that as the Congress made the money they also can destroy it; and that it will exist no longer than they find it convenient to permit it. . . . We should pay an ill compliment to the understanding and honour of every true American, were we to adduce many arguments to shew the baseness or bad policy of violating our national faith, or omitting to pursue the measures necessary to preserve it. A bankrupt faithless republic would be a novelty in the political world, and appear among reputable nations like a common prostitute among chaste and respectable matrons. The pride of America revolts from the idea: her citizens know for what purposes these emissions were made, and have repeatedly plighted their faith for the redemption of them; they are to be found in every man's possession, and every man is interested in their being redeemed; they must therefore entertain a high opinion

of American credulity, who suppose the people capable of believing, on due reflection, that all America will, against the faith, the honour and the interest of all America, be ever prevailed upon to countenance, support or permit so ruinous so disgraceful a measure . . . it is impossible that America should think without horror of such an execrable deed.<sup>1</sup>

Six months after this bold assertion was uttered the "execrable deed" was done. In March, 1780, the famous forty-for-one act was passed, forty dollars in bills of credit were declared to be equal to one in specie, provision for their redemption at this rate in new-tenor bills was made, and thirty-nine-fortieths of the continental paper debt was repudiated. "This", said Witherspoon, was "the first and great deliberate breach of public faith."

The second was like unto it. Ten years passed away, and our country, a sovereign, free, and independent republic, had taken her place among the nations of the world. The old Articles of Confederation had been abandoned, and the Constitution framed and adopted. The people, as the phrase went, had come under the new roof. Congress had been given express power to pay the debts of the United States, and in 1790 undertook to fund those incurred by the Continental Congress, and to assume and fund those created by the states in the war for independence. The old excuse that Congress could not tax, that the states did not respond to appeals for money, were no longer available, for Congress had ample power to lay taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. For a people living under a high standard of public morals the opportunity, it would seem, had come to wipe off a foul spot on the good name of America. But the chance was not made use of; and when the funding bill passed, it contained a provision for the redemption of the continental bills of credit at one cent in the dollar, and ninety-nine-hundredths of the debt was repudiated.

But the bills of credit were by no means the only kind of indebtedness. There were the loan-office certificates, the lottery tickets, the interest indents, the quartermasters' certificates, the commissary certificates, the final settlements with the soldiers, and many other sorts of paper acknowledgments of debt. What, it was asked, shall be done with these? Some were for funding them at their face-value in interest-bearing stock. Others, and a very considerable number of others, led on by Madison, insisted on discrimination between the original holder of the paper and subsequent takers. Where the certificate, the indent, the lottery ticket, was in the hands of the man who first received it, the obligation should be funded at the value expressed on its face. Where paper had passed from hand

<sup>1</sup> *Journals of Congress*. September 13, 1779.



to hand and was in the possession of one not the original receiver, it should be funded at its highest market value. Here—aside from the effect such an act would have on the credit of the country, a question of commercial expediency—was a question of public morals.

The United States could not be legally forced to pay its debts. Was it not, therefore, morally bound to do so? The anti-funders thought not. If you gave a creditor face-value for an obligation for which he could never have received face-value from a fellow-man, or fifteen shillings for something he had taken or purchased from his neighbor for ten or five or two shillings, you were not only just, but most liberal. When the long struggle ended, the certificates were, indeed, funded at their face-value, not because it was morally right, but because of a bargain by which one party secured the passage of the funding and assumption acts and the other the location of the Federal City on the banks of the Potomac.

The question of the obligation of the body politic to pay its debts now passed to the states, and two years later appeared before the Supreme Court. A citizen of South Carolina, acting as executor, had tendered the treasurer of Georgia in payment of taxes some paper money of that state. The money was refused, and in 1792 suit was brought in the Supreme Court of the United States. The question before it was, May a sovereign state be sued by a citizen of another state? But back of it all was the greater question, May a state be compelled by process of law to redeem promises and pledges for which it stands morally bound? The court decided that a state may be sued; but Chief Justice Jay in delivering its decision added the caution:

Lest I should be understood in a latitude beyond my meaning, I think it necessary to subjoin this caution, viz.: That such suability may nevertheless not extend to all the demands, and to every kind of action; there may be exceptions. For instance, I am far from being prepared to say that an individual may sue a state on bills of credit issued before the Constitution was established, and which were issued and received on the faith of the state, and at a time when no ideas or expectations of judicial interposition were entertained or contemplated.

Despite this caution the decision was alarming; but a remedy was quickly found. The decision was handed down on the eighteenth of February, 1793, and the very next day a member from Massachusetts gave notice in the House of Representatives that he should move an amendment to the Constitution designed to protect states from being sued in the federal courts. On the twentieth the amendment was offered in the Senate. Less than two weeks of the session then remained. To act in so short a time was hardly possible, and the matter went over to the Third Congress. Ere that body met,

Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland protested against the decision of the court; and when January, 1794, came, the amendment was again offered in the Senate, was quickly adopted, and January 8, 1798, Adams in a message to Congress announced that the amendment "may now be declared to be a part of the Constitution of the United States". Of all provisions of the Federal Constitution this alone deserves to be called infamous, for under its protection many a state has since found refuge from the payment of its just debts. Yet the men who framed it are not to be condemned. They were simply following the standard of public morality set up in their day.

Two years later our annals afford another glimpse of public morals. The French Republic between February 1, 1793, and September 30, 1800, had committed spoliations on the property of certain citizens of the United States. But France also had claims on us, and in the attempt to adjust the indemnities due each party in 1800 the plenipotentiaries of France and the United States fell out. An article was therefore inserted in the convention which declared that "The Ministers Plenipotentiary of the two parties not being able to agree at present . . . upon the indemnities mutually due or claimed, the parties will negotiate further on these subjects at a convenient time." But the Senate before ratifying the convention struck out this article, and the document thus altered went back to Napoleon, who again ratified it in July, 1801, with this important addition: "The government of the United States . . . having omitted the second article, the government of the French Republic consents to accept, ratify, and confirm the above convention . . . with the retrenchment of the second article: Provided, That by this retrenchment the two States renounce the respective pretensions, which are the object of the said article." The convention, as amended by the First Consul, now returned to the United States, was again ratified by the Senate, and then proclaimed part of the supreme law of the land by Jefferson in December, 1801.

Our country was thereby released from all liability for damages because of alleged violation of the ancient treaties with France. The price paid for this release was the waiving of the claims of our countrymen for indemnity from France. Having cut off its citizens from the possibility of recovery abroad, the United States became morally bound to pay them at home, for it had received due consideration in exchange. But eighty years and more went by before these spoliation claims were sent for adjudication to the Court of Claims, and ninety years passed before Congress made its first appropriation toward payment of the awards.

Two years after the ratification of the convention of 1801 we had

another financial transaction with Napoleon and purchased Louisiana. By the secret treaty of San Ildefonso, Spain had agreed to retrocede Louisiana to France on certain conditions, one of which was a solemn pledge never to alienate the province. In spite of this, however, Napoleon three years later sold Louisiana to us, an act which was a flat violation of the treaty of San Ildefonso. Nay more, Louisiana at that time did not belong to France. The retrocession had not been consummated, and when in 1803 Napoleon affixed his name and seal to the treaty of purchase, the flag of Spain still floated over every fort, and her authority was still recognized in every quarter of that broad domain. Nor could Napoleon, had Louisiana belonged to France, have sold it without consent of the French Chambers. That consent was not even asked, and the United States took title to Louisiana and received it from a man who had neither the legal nor the moral right to dispose of it.

The province thus acquired was soon cut into two pieces, and for one of them known as the Territory of Orleans a certain form of government was provided by Congress. The legislative power was vested in a governor and a council of thirteen appointed annually by the President without consulting the Senate. This council met when the governor summoned it and went home when he prorogued it, and could not frame a bill of any sort, but merely criticize such as the governor placed before it. In the selection of this body the people had absolutely no voice whatever. Yet the hand which signed that act of congress and made it law was the same that wrote those memorable words in the Declaration of Independence, all governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed". To the American of 1804 this was a living truth, not a "glittering generality", and such a storm of indignant protest followed the passage of the act organizing the Territory of Orleans that at the next session of Congress it was repealed.

Turning from the Federal Constitution and statutes to the constitutions and laws of the states, we find them richer still in illustrations of old-time standards of public morals. While the war for independence was under way, the states as well as Congress had issued millions of dollars in paper money, had made it legal tender, and had provided heavy punishments for any one who would not take it at the face-value. The merchant, the shopkeeper, the farmer who presumed to demand for his goods or produce a larger sum in paper than in specie was an enemy of his country, a forestaller, an engrosser, a sharper, and might be stripped of his property, fined, imprisoned, or banished from the state. All respect for the rights of property was thus overthrown. Such measures, said a body of

protestants against the Pennsylvania legal-tender act of 1781, "render our courts of justice the ministers of iniquity. Instead of compelling the performance of contracts, they not only permit and countenance, but aid and assist the violation of them. Hence it must follow that the magistrates will be disrespected, the laws contravened and the morals of the people polluted." "For two or three years", said Witherspoon, "we constantly saw and were informed of creditors running away from their debtors, and the debtors pursuing them in triumph, and paying them without mercy." Pelatiah Webster declares that the legal-tender currency "polluted the equity of our laws, turned them into engines of oppression and wrong, corrupted the justice of our public administration, destroyed the fortunes of thousands who had most confidence in it", and ruined "the morality of our people".

To a people struggling for political life much should be forgiven. But when the war was fought and won, when the states were free and independent, the evil practice was continued. During the hard times of 1785 and 1786 seven states put forth more paper money and strove to keep it at par by legal-tender acts. Again the sanctity of contracts was violated, and dishonest men made haste to pay their debts in worthless paper. The Superior Court of Rhode Island during one sitting heard twenty bills in equity filed by debtors who sought to satisfy mortgages. They came bringing the money in handkerchiefs, pillow-cases, and bags. In the newspapers, for several months in 1786, were columns of notices by the judges that sums in lawful money bills had been deposited with them by men who had in all respects complied with the legal-tender law. In South Carolina the grand-jury of Ninety-Six in a presentment in December, 1788, declared "that the many acts of the legislature screening the debtor from the just demand of his fair and bona fide creditor have had a very pernicious influence on the morals and manners of the people".

The framers of the Constitution undoubtedly wished and believed that they had put an end to such practices by that wise provision that no state shall issue bills of credit, or make anything but gold and silver legal tender for debt. But the Constitution had not been long in force before the states began to charter banks and gave each one of them authority to issue bills of credit. That a principal cannot give an agent authority to do an act which the principal cannot lawfully do himself is primary law. Nevertheless the right to issue paper bills was granted, our country entered on a new era of paper money, and in the course of our second war with Great Britain every bank outside of New England suspended specie payment. Desper-

ately hard times followed; the legislatures were appealed to as usual for relief and again enacted laws interfering with the collection of debts and violating contracts. In some states temporary stay laws put an end for the time being to all suits for the collection of debts. In others, if the creditor would not take bank paper, the debtor had two years in which to replevy. In still others, all property seized in satisfaction of a judgment must be appraised by a jury of the neighborhood, and when offered for sale by the sheriff must bring three-fourths of the appraised value, or it could not be sold. Here was a most effective stay law, for it was indeed a hard-hearted jury that would not appraise a poor debtor's property at five times its actual value.

In many points of view the Americans of Washington's day and the American of our day have changed places. Customs, usages, and institutions which the fathers held to be against good public morals, we tolerate; and then, in our turn, proscribe by law a host of practices our forefathers looked upon as highly beneficial to the state. A signal instance of such a change in the moral standard is our present hostility toward the lottery. During the years immediately following the war for independence, when there were not in the whole country as many people as to-day dwell in Pennsylvania or New York, it was not possible to obtain by taxation the money needed for all sorts of public betterments. Very few communities were willing to have their taxes increased in order that a street might be paved, a wharf constructed, a fire-engine bought, a city hall enlarged, or a bridge built across some neighboring stream, when the funds could be secured by so simple a process as the sale of a few thousand tickets, and the distribution of a few hundred prizes. To solicit subscriptions for the discharge of a church debt, the purchase of a bell, the erection of a steeple or a parsonage, the purchase of books or physical apparatus for a college, when the money could be secured more quickly by a lottery, was a waste of time. Why should a canal company, a turnpike company, the projectors of a woollen-mill, iron-furnace, or glass-works seek a market for stock, when any legislature stood ready to grant authority to start a lottery with as many drawings as were necessary to raise the needed money?

After the Revolution, when our country began to develop at a rapid pace, and lotteries increased astonishingly in number, the economic effects became apparent, and many a state forbade the sale within its boundaries of the tickets in lotteries not authorized by itself. But not until the increase of the people in numbers and in wealth made it possible to raise money for public improvements

by taxation, or by the sale of stock, was the lottery looked on as against good public morals, and the thirties came before Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland put it under ban.

In the bill of rights of the first constitution of New Hampshire is the assurance that "every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and reason; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience. . . ." Yet, in defiance of this assertion, men were restrained of their liberty by the provisions "that no person shall be capable of being elected a Senator, who is not of the Protestant religion", and that every member of the House of Representatives "shall be of the Protestant religion", and that no person should be chosen president of the state or delegate to the Continental Congress who was not of the Protestant religion. In the declaration of rights of Massachusetts, in the constitution of New Jersey, in the declarations of rights of Pennsylvania, of Delaware, and of Maryland, were assertions of absolute religious liberty quite as emphatic. Yet in Massachusetts the governor and lieutenant-governor, councillors, senators, and representatives before taking office were each required to declare, "I believe the Christian religion and have a firm persuasion of its truth"; and in New Jersey none but Protestants were "capable of being elected into any office of either branch of the legislature". "Nor can any man", said Pennsylvania, "who acknowledges the being of God be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen"; yet each member of the legislature before taking his seat was required to make a declaration in which were the words, "And I do acknowledge the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration". Delaware required her legislators to swear to a belief in the Trinity as well as in the divine inspiration of both Testaments; and Maryland exacted from every holder of offices of profit or trust "a declaration of his belief in the Christian religion". North Carolina decreed that "no person who shall deny the being of a God, or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testament, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State." South Carolina enacted that "The Christian Protestant religion shall be deemed and is hereby constituted and declared to be the established religion of this State", and allowed none but Protestants

to hold office. Georgia excluded from her important offices all men who were not Protestants.

Under these standards of public morals all forms of religious belief were tolerated; yet only those men who exercised this toleration in such manner as to become Protestants or Christians could be eligible to offices of state. The preaching, as it should always be, was above the practice. The moral standard, as it should always be, was far in advance of the times. To the credit of the fathers, many of them soon overtook it. When the Federal Constitution was framed in 1787, Church and State were absolutely divorced. The word "God" was nowhere inserted, and religious belief was nowhere recognized as a qualification for anything. This, in the opinion of many, was a great step backward. A delegate to the Massachusetts state convention to consider the Constitution "shuddered at the idea that Romanists and pagans might be introduced into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America". In the convention of North Carolina, and in many a newspaper criticism of the New Roof, the charge was made that, without some religious test, Jews, infidels, papists, were as eligible to the presidency and to seats in Congress as any Protestant or Christian. The absence of religious tests and qualifications was in reality a step forward, and was quickly followed in several states. Pennsylvania in 1790 abolished the test oath formerly required of her legislators; New Hampshire in 1792 cast away the religious test previously exacted from her governors and legislators; and Delaware ceased to ask her office-holders if they believed in the Trinity and the divine inspiration of the Testaments. After 1790 South Carolina no longer required members of the House of Representatives to be Protestants; and in 1798 Georgia removed her religious test for office-holding, and decreed that no person should "be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles". Of the three new states which entered the Union before the end of the century (Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee), Tennessee alone adhered to the old standard. Her bill of rights declared "That no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this State". But her constitution declared that "No person who denies the being of a God or future state of rewards and punishments shall hold any office in the civil department of this state."

In six of these early state constitutions are declarations that neither cruel nor unusual punishments shall be inflicted. The principle asserted erected no new standard of public morals, for the words were borrowed from that Great Bill of Rights enacted by Parliament



nearly ninety years before the first state constitution was adopted. But it is worth while to consider what the fathers regarded as mild punishment, what sort of penalties awaited the transgressor of their code of public morals. Publicity, in their opinion, was the great deterrent of crime. It was not enough, therefore, that the criminal should be punished; he should be punished in the presence of the people, that all might behold justice administered and the law vindicated, and learn from impressive examples to shun the path of the wicked. The man or woman on whom death was inflicted was accordingly hanged in the open before a crowd of men and women, who came bringing their children with them. The list of crimes so punishable in colonial days was a long one: in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island ten; in New York sixteen; in Virginia and afterward in Kentucky twenty-seven; in Pennsylvania twenty on first conviction, and on a second conviction all save larceny were capital crimes.

For the evil-doers whose offenses did not merit death there were flogging, branding, cropping, the pillory, and the ducking-stool. Each punishment was inflicted in public, and many an offender went forth from the place of expiation bearing on his forehead or his hand a mark which made his character known to all who met him. New Hampshire branded her burglars with a B on the right hand for the first offense, on the left for the second offense, on the forehead if the crime was committed on the Lord's Day.

Massachusetts punished ten crimes and felonies with death; branded an F on the forehead of the forger of a bank-bill, a B on both cheeks of the burglar guilty of a second offense, a T on both cheeks of the man twice convicted of larceny, and M on the forehead for manslaughter; and gave to her magistrates an elaborate assortment of penalties from which to choose for minor offenses. The perjurer might be fined and pilloried for two hours at diverse times and places as the judge thought proper, and be publicly whipped on the naked back on three occasions in three different places. The thief for a second offense, besides being branded, might be condemned to hard labor for life and be made to "wear a chain round his leg with a large clog fastened to the other end thereof"; the forger might be pilloried, cropped on one ear, whipped, fined, and imprisoned; the counterfeiter could be set in the pillory and have one ear cut off, and thence be driven with a rope about his neck to the gallows, where with one end of the rope thrown over the gallows he must stand for one hour. On the way from the pillory to the gallows he might be given forty lashes.

In Connecticut the man who married his sister-in-law could be



set on the gallows with the wife, each with a rope about the neck, for one hour. The pair must then be taken to the common jail, and while on the way be given forty lashes each on the bare back; and "forever after", says the law, "wear a capital I two inches long" of some bright-colored cloth sewed on the outside of the arm or on the back. The perjurer should be fined twenty pounds; if he could not pay, then he must stand for an hour in the pillory "and have both ears nailed". The horse-thief must return treble the value of the horse and pay a fine of ten pounds, receive fifteen lashes, pass three months in the workhouse, and on the first Monday of each month receive ten stripes and be seated astride the wooden horse for two hours before each whipping.

Delaware punished her criminals according to the laws in force in Great Britain. If the crime was capital in the mother-country, it was so in the colony. If under English law the offender might plead benefit of clergy, he could do so in Delaware, and without being required to read like a clerk, was branded on the left thumb in open court. M stood for manslaughter and T for any felony.

The North Carolina law on the subject of perjury gives a graphic description of this process of ear-cutting. The offender, whether man or woman, "shall stand", says the law, "in the pillory one hour, having his or her ears nailed during the whole time, and at the expiration of the said hour, both ears of the offender shall be cut off and severed from the head, leaving them nailed on the pillory until the setting of the sun."

In Pennsylvania the robber and the thief, whether man or woman, after receiving thirty-one lashes at the whipping-post was condemned to have sewed in plain view on the left sleeve of the outer garment between the shoulder and the elbow a Roman T of red, blue, or yellow cloth as the magistrate pleased, and wear it every day from sunrise to sunset for six months. In Maryland each county was required to have an assortment of branding-irons. S on either cheek meant seditious libeller; F meant forger; a T on the left hand indicated a thief; and R on the shoulder a vagabond or rogue. In Delaware the penalties for blasphemy were flogging, the pillory, and the letter B branded on the forehead. In Pennsylvania every pauper who received alms of the public (and his wife and children, if he had any) must wear on the sleeve of the outer garment a large P of red or blue cloth, and after it the initial letter of the county, town, or city by which the alms were given.

The standard of public morals under which the use of the lash, the branding-iron, the pillory, and the ducking-stool was possible was no invention of the fathers. It was that of the mother-country transferred to the colonies, and was greatly modified after the Revo-

lution. Many of the states cut down the list of crimes punishable by death, forbade the use of the branding-iron, cropping, and flogging. But the development of a more humane standard was slow; and many of the old penal codes were in force and many of the old punishments were inflicted well down into the nineteenth century. In Boston in 1789 five thieves were flogged, two more stood under the gallows, and a counterfeiter on the pillory. In 1789 in the same city eleven offenders were sentenced to be flogged in front of the State House, and in 1803 two men were pilloried for one hour on two consecutive days. So late as 1822 a felon was flogged on the campus of Yale College, and in 1817 a sailor underwent a like punishment in Philadelphia. In 1821 the Supreme Court of Georgia sentenced a woman to be ducked in the Oconee; and in 1819 in Georgia, and in 1824 in Philadelphia, common scolds were ordered to the ducking-stool; but the sentence was not executed. Late yet Judge Cranch in Washington sentenced Mrs. Ann Royal to be ducked in the Potomac. But the day for such punishments had passed away, and she was fined instead.

There were, however, even then states on whose statute-books the old code still had a place. In Rhode Island the convicted forger of notes, bank-bills, or securities might be placed in the pillory, have a piece of each ear cut off, be branded while in the pillory with the letter C, imprisoned for six years, and fined. For perjury the penalty was cropping, branding, and three hours on the pillory; for duelling, a rope about the neck and a ride in a cart to the gallows, where the offender must stand for an hour. The man guilty of arson, the law required, should be pilloried, cropped on both ears, and branded with the letter B. Delaware flogged, pilloried, and sold her criminals to service, and required some to wear on the outer garment between the shoulders a scarlet letter four or six inches long to designate his crimes. A Roman F meant forger; T meant thief; R a receiver of stolen goods. Down to the Civil War, branding on the hand was occasionally inflicted on men guilty of slave-stealing.

The second quarter of the nineteenth century was a period of general reform. Customs, usages, and institutions which a few years before passed unchallenged were vigorously attacked as ruinous to good morals. Executions of criminals in the presence of great crowds of men and women were denounced as scandalous, and one by one the states forbade them. Imprisonment for debt was abolished as a practice wholly at variance with the public welfare and grossly unjust to the individual. Slavery was attacked as a sin, the lottery was proscribed—in short, new standards of public morals were erected.

JOHN BACH McMASTER.

## RECENT TENDENCIES IN THE STUDY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

ONE hundred and sixteen years have elapsed since the French National Assembly issued a remarkable manifesto in which it discussed the nature, extent, and general beneficence of the Revolution. After only six or seven months of work the Assembly ventured to claim that under its auspices "an old and corrupt nation had been born again into liberty"; the rights of man, misconceived and insulted for centuries, had been re-established for all mankind; privileges without number which had formed the public law of France had been abolished for ever. "Is there a single citizen worthy of the name", it exclaims, "who dares to look back, who would once more rebuild the ruins which surround us in order to contemplate again the former structure?"

Yet not a few have dared to look back with regret, even with yearning, upon that Ancien Régime whose ruins the Assembly so plentifully sowed with the salt of its contempt. Indeed a writer of our own day, M. Charles d'Héricault, solemnized the hundredth anniversary of the meeting of the Estates General by rebuilding the ancient edifice with idyllic grace and peopling it with a happy and virtuous throng who had lived together in blessed concord until they suffered themselves to be alienated from God and their king by the satanic obsession of the Revolution. According to M. d'Héricault, the Ancien Régime had served to develop "in the highest degree in each social class those particular qualities required in order that all might work together toward the organization of a perfect society. There was, first of all, the priest, wise, venerable, devoted; then the former despot, now transformed into a courtly and respected king; and the soldier, now a polished nobleman, the soul of honor. The bourgeoisie were rich, dignified, and well educated; lastly the people, pious and gentle, consoled themselves for the lesser troubles of life by amassing wealth, by singing and dancing, while they met their graver misfortunes by the thought of heaven."

But all at once with stupifying suddenness and inhuman violence this happy, Christian, and monarchical France began cursing both priests and kings; she bowed down before a new goddess with all the devotion which she had formerly lavished upon her old guides

whom she would now exterminate—"Cette idole nouvelle, c'est ce qu'on nomma fort justement la Révolution."<sup>1</sup>

It might at first sight seem hardly necessary to reckon seriously with the opinions of a hopelessly reactionary royalist who received his earliest impressions under Charles X. But M. d'Héricault is only one of a group of really important and scholarly writers who in the interests of reaction have devoted themselves to picturing the horrors and anarchy of the Reign of Terror. Moreover, the existence of this class of historians can alone explain the attitude of the exalted Republicans, who by no means consent to pass over the utterances of their inveterate enemies in silent contempt.<sup>2</sup>

When the present municipal government of Paris subsidizes historical investigation, it is influenced by something more than scientific interest or even ordinary civic pride. The acts of the Commune during the Revolution are being collected and published with a view of establishing "the immortal glory of Paris" in forwarding "the emancipation of humanity". They show how the representatives of Paris founded a new order based on liberty and equality, "opposing virtue alone, patriotism, and self-abnegation to the treason, perfidy, and calumny which the selfishness of the aristocrats never ceased to foment against those noble citizens of whom

<sup>1</sup> *La France Révolutionnaire, 1789-1889* (Paris, 1889), p. i. M. d'Héricault's eulogy of the Ancien Régime first appeared in the opening issue of the *Revue de la Révolution* (1883), a valuable but highly reactionary periodical which he edited. Since it is impossible to reproduce in English the exalted impression made by M. d'Héricault's own mother-tongue, I add a short passage in the original:

"La France est une nation naturellement guerrière et sensible, formée par des évêques, élevée par des rois.

"Les évêques, en entretenant, par une infatigable prédication, la force morale dans son âme gracieuse, firent des Français un peuple enthousiaste. Les rois, en satisfaisant ses instincts guerriers par une activité tournée presque continuellement vers un grand but, qui était l'unité de la patrie, en firent un peuple docile.

"Quand, après douze siècles de cette éducation pieuse et de cette tutelle monarchique, la France, continuant une enfance pleine de foi et une jeunesse glorieuse, entra dans la maturité, elle présenta un modèle de civilisation qui parut achevé. L'Europe, avec une envie bientôt subjuguée, y vint admirer l'humanité dans sa grâce noble et artistique, dans tout le développement de la force intellectuelle, soit littéraire, soit philosophique.

"Pour l'observateur, cette civilisation de la France virile, de la France du dix-septième siècle, possédait surtout un don excellent: elle avait développé, dans chaque classe sociale, la plus haute des qualités qui sont requises en chacune de ces classes pour travailler à organiser une société parfaite."

<sup>2</sup> Even those who are not royalists or even reactionary may be charged with loving too well the old order of things. According to M. Aulard, M. Funck-Brentano "est accusé de se montrer partial pour l'ancien régime, partial avec attendrissement". This fearful suspicion has given rise to some bitterness between the two scholars. See *La Révolution Française*, XLIV. 376 (1903). The trouble arose in connection with the sentiments expressed by Funck-Brentano in his recent studies, *L'Afrique du Collier*—an episode to which he attributes great importance—and the sequel to the affair, *La Mort de la Reine*.

they might make martyrs but never renegades".<sup>1</sup> When one calmly considers the rôle of the Paris Commune in the establishing of the first French republic, such sentiments appear quite as absurdly apologetic as M. d'Héricault's picture of the felicity of the Ancien Régime.

In short, Frenchmen still love or hate the Revolution as did their forefathers in 1790. A writer has very recently declared that "the idea of treating the Revolution as an event analogous to other events, without either curses or apologies, has as yet never occurred to any one."<sup>2</sup> This is certainly unfair, but it is far nearer the truth than Aulard's claim that he and his band treat the history of the Revolution in the same spirit in which they might deal with that of Greece or Rome. It will be a long time before Frenchmen will speak of Danton, Anacharsis Cloots, Lafayette, and Desmoulins in the same disengaged spirit in which they might of Cleon, Brasidas, Nicias, and Aristophanes.

The first tendency, then, which may be noted in the study of the Revolution is that toward partizan enthusiasm<sup>3</sup> which is still perpetuated in many important works and must still be reckoned with as it had to be reckoned with a hundred years ago. In this respect the Revolution bears out the observation of Tocqueville that, although political in its nature, it proceeded in the manner of a religious revolution, for it stirred up animosities which in their inveterate bitterness rank with the hateful emotions that have accompanied religious changes. The explanation of this perpetual partizanship is to be sought partly in the French temperament, but chiefly in the fact that the Revolution did not succeed in settling some of the most important questions that it raised, notably the nature of the central government and the relations between Church and State. Then the successive constitutional revolutions, although by no means so fundamental as commonly supposed, have served to raise the spirits of each party in turn and so to perpetuate hopes in the breasts of the most radical as well as the most conservative. Consequently the first Revolution forms the background of every debate upon current issues, and the "principles of 1789" are ap-

<sup>1</sup> *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, edited for the city by Lacroix, I. p. i (1894).

<sup>2</sup> T. Cerfberr, *Essai sur le Mouvement Social et Intellectuel en France depuis 1789* (Paris, 1902), 113. Aulard sadly comments on Cerfberr's harsh judgment: "C'est étrangement méconnaître tout ce que mes amis et moi, depuis bientôt vingt ans, avons écrit et professé, sans éclat et sans talent, je le veux bien, mais en proclamant très haut et en poursuivant sans relâche le dessein d'étudier l'histoire de la Révolution 'sans anathème comme sans apologie'". *La Révolution Française*, XLII. 475.

<sup>3</sup> I recollect a discussion some fifteen years ago in the Paris newspapers of a question raised in the *Chambre des Députés* as to whether it was necessary to defend or abhor the Revolution *en bloc*.

pealed to with interpretations varying with the taste, purposes, and convictions of each particular orator who evokes them.

One may, however, permit his politics to be influenced by a more or less fantastic conception of the genius of the Revolution, and yet do much to promote sound historical learning.<sup>1</sup> Even the un-fairest and most sentimental writer may be moved by the modern passion for "documentation", and supply his readers with neglected archival material. There is a general agreement among both the friends and the foes of the Revolution as to the rules of the game. They are at one in the conviction that the basis of historical research must be constantly broadened by the publication of documentary matter of all kinds; consequently the work of rendering new sources of knowledge available by printing, and by classifying and cataloguing the unprinted material, is now proceeding with bewildering rapidity. This is seen in the ever-increasing mass of documents, documented monographs, local histories, historical periodicals, proceedings, reports, and bulletins of historical associations which are pouring from the presses of Paris and the provinces in a stream of ever-increasing width and depth.

Efforts to make the sources readily available began with the meeting of the Estates General. The proceedings of the assembly, reports of its committees, and the debates and speeches were published contemporaneously in a more or less imperfect form.<sup>2</sup> The *Moniteur*, the newspaper of the period most nearly resembling a modern journal, was early reprinted with an excellent documentary introduction dealing with the circumstances of the assembling of the Estates General. There were, of course, innumerable pamphlets, newspapers, and memoirs. A collection of the latter began to appear in 1820 under the editorship of Berville and Barrière (1820-1827, in fifty-five volumes). Still very valuable for the isolated and impecunious student is the motley collection of Buchez and Roux, *Histoire Parlementaire de la Révolution*, published in forty handy volumes, 1834-1838, and readily procurable through the Paris bouquinistes. The *Archives Parlementaires*, undertaken under Napoleon III. and purporting to contain a complete collection of the debates in the successive French legislative bodies, has failed to reach a high standard of excellence. Of the first series (1789-1800) some sixty-six volumes have appeared, coming down to the middle of the year 1793. It is carelessly edited, and the whole work is

<sup>1</sup> Monin says in his notice of Chassin's career: "Il semble qu'il ne demandait à l'histoire idéalisée de la Révolution que de nouvelles forces pour la lutte quotidienne." *La Révolution Française*, XLI. 100 (1901).

<sup>2</sup> A particularly large collection of these is in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.

condemned, with perhaps undue harshness, by Aulard and others as "fantaisiste". It is probable that the immense task will have to be done all over again.<sup>1</sup>

As is well known, Guizot when minister of public education created a commission to take charge of the investigation and publication of unpublished material relating to the history of France. Since its original appointment in 1834 this commission, which has undergone a number of metamorphoses and is now called the Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques, has been issuing the great *Collection de Documents Inédits*. Until 1886 it confined its activity to the period before the Revolution, but in that year a special subcommission was created to attend to material having to do with the Revolution, so that during the past twenty years the French national government has been promoting the printing of important sources for the period under consideration.<sup>2</sup> As examples of this material may be mentioned the acts of the Committee of Public Safety, edited by Aulard, of which sixteen volumes have appeared; Brette's material relating to the convocation of the Estates General (volumes I.-III.); the correspondence of Mercy-Argenteau, of Madame Roland, and of Carnot; Flammermont's remarkable collection of the protests of the *Parlement* of Paris during the eighteenth century; and the proceedings of the several committees on public instruction of the Constituante and the Convention.

In December, 1886, shortly before the anniversary of the first appearance of the Paris Commune upon the stage of history, the Municipal Council of Paris established a committee to effect "the orderly publication of scattered or unpublished original documents which would serve to make clear the rôle of the Commune of Paris in the great revolutionary movement which during the years 1789-1800 laid the foundations, so to speak, for the emancipation of humanity".<sup>3</sup> The municipality has accordingly been publishing since 1888 the *Collection de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution Française*. About forty stout volumes have already appeared, and new projects are announced from time to time. The series embraces the acts of the Commune, part I., in seven volumes, edited by Lacroix (part II. in preparation, three volumes already issued, 1900-1905); the proceedings of the Jacobin Club, edited by the indefatigable M. Aulard, who is most prominent among the con-

<sup>1</sup> See articles in the *Revue Historique*, LXXXI. 433-436 (1903), and *La Révolution Française*, XVI. 5-29, 193-208 (1889).

<sup>2</sup> See Langlois, *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique*, part II. 357 et seqq. For a list of the volumes published by the commission see the *Bibliographie* which it issued in 1808 and the lists which now and then accompany current issues.

<sup>3</sup> Jules Cousin in the session of January 31, 1887, *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, I. i.



tributors; Chassin's and Charavay's collections relating to the Paris elections in 1789, the Paris cahiers, and the later history of the electoral assembly; Monin's *L'État de Paris en 1789*; and Aulard's seven volumes on Paris during the reaction of Thermidor, the Directory, and the Consulate. Dr. Robinet has given us two volumes on the religious movement. Two vast classified bibliographies are in course of publication, that of Tourneux for the printed sources and of Tuetey for the manuscript material.

But these large sets published under government auspices in no way exhaust the output of unpublished material. The *furor de l'inédit*, of which Brunetière has spoken, becomes more furious daily. The most audacious projects are formulated for almost hopelessly increasing the mass of data at our disposal. The *Révolution Française*, a periodical now in its fiftieth volume and edited by M. Aulard, devotes its whole attention to the progress of the study of the Revolutionary period and publishes many documents. It is now reinforced by the new *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, edited by Caron and Sagnac, which naturally enters the same field rather more frequently than a more general review like the *Revue Historique* or the *Revue des Questions Historiques*.<sup>1</sup> Writers of monographs weigh down their volumes with an ever-increasing number of *pièces justificatives*, which not infrequently form the chief value of the work.

Then there are the local historical associations with which, as Langlois says, France is "saturated."<sup>2</sup> Upward of three hundred are busy printing reports, proceedings, bulletins, or regular periodicals. No single library can flatter itself that it contains complete collections of these local publications, although much valuable material and useful discussion is buried in them, not a little of which has a bearing on the Revolution.

In spite, however, of the bewildering amount of authentic data already at hand, it is generally conceded that there is far too little to enable historians of the period to settle some of the most funda-

<sup>1</sup> The *Revue de la Révolution*, edited by d'Héricault and Bord, which began to appear in 1883, was discontinued after 1887. It was a continued and violent attack on the Revolution, as might be expected if we remember that M. d'Héricault declared all republicans "voués par leur essence même à l'iniquité et à la bêtise". Nevertheless the publication contained many valuable articles, documents, and illustrations.

<sup>2</sup> M. R. de Lasteyrie's *Bibliographie Générale des Travaux Historiques et Archéologiques Publiés par les Sociétés Savantes de la France* (1888-1905, 4 vols.) is a minute, painstaking catalogue of their publications, giving the title and contents of each volume, prefaced by a historical note on the organization, etc., of each society. A supplement 1885-1900 is projected, and the first two instalments of an annual continuation, 1901-1902 and 1902-1903 (1904, 1905), have appeared.



mental questions. Two years ago Jaurès, the distinguished leader of the more broad-minded among the French socialists, urged in the Chamber of Deputies that a commission should be appointed to effect, under government auspices, a classification and publication of the documents in the national and local archives relating to the economic phases of the Revolution. He quite properly urged that this field was more important than the political, to which so much attention had been given. Following his recommendation, the minister of public instruction appointed such a commission December 21, 1903, to take a place beside that originally established by Guizot. Its members include many of the foremost French historians—Jaurès, chairman, Aulard, Brette, Bloch, Caron, Esmein, Gide, Glas-son, Lavissee, Levasseur, Sagnac, Sée, Seignobos, and others.

The ministerial instructions relating to the commission's activity, issued April 19, 1904,<sup>1</sup> restrict their field to the period 1789-1800, although such attention may be given to the Ancien Régime as is necessary to an understanding of the situation of France upon the meeting of the Estates General. The chief topics for which material is to be published are the following: the economic conditions in France in 1789, especially as revealed in the cahiers of the parishes and various corporations; the guilds and their abolition; the feudal dues, their persistence and gradual extinction; an inventory of the church possessions and those of the émigrés, their sale, and the history of the assignats; changes in agriculture, industries, domestic and foreign commerce, payment of taxes, the question of supplies and of the maximum, shifting of population, rates of wages, mortgages, effects of laws relating to inheritance, etc.—a comprehensive programme indeed.

The commission has decided to publish the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly's committee on industry and agriculture, to occupy perhaps three volumes, and has designated MM. Caron and Sagnac to edit a collection of documents relating to the abolition of the seigniorial system, 1789-1793.<sup>2</sup> But these are mere trifles in comparison with two far more ambitious and important undertakings which the commission now has under way.<sup>3</sup>

The first of these is the systematic publication of the cahiers of 1789, that is to say, the lists of grievances and suggestions for reform prepared by every parish and town in France upon the occa-

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *La Révolution Française*, XLVI. 451-459.

<sup>2</sup> This is in press. Sagnac gives an account of the undertaking *ibid.*, December, 1905 (XLIX. 481-500).

<sup>3</sup> For an account of the commission's work see *ibid.*, January, April, and December issues, 1905 (XLVIII. 66-70, 353-363; XLIX. 537-547, 561-563). There the reader will find the method of co-operation between the various departmental committees described.

sion of the summoning of the Estates General. The importance of this unique historical material has been estimated variously.<sup>1</sup> It seems preposterous, however, making every allowance for the influence of model cahiers slavishly copied, to refuse to assign to this unique document in the history of nations a most exalted place in the hierarchy of sources. It is, as Tocqueville has well said, the last will and testament of the Ancien Régime; and no more worthy or far-reaching service could be rendered by the new commission than the preparation of a scholarly and complete edition of the local cahiers. The *Archives Parlementaires*, referred to above, devoted its first six or seven volumes to the cahiers of the electoral districts—the so-called *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées*. The work was, however, badly done, and a number of private and quite unofficial cahiers were included. On the other hand, almost all the original local cahiers of the parishes and of the various urban corporations—which were later edited and condensed into the more general cahier of each electoral district—were omitted altogether by the editors of the *Archives*.<sup>2</sup> Had all these been included, they would, according to the estimate of M. Brette, have filled no less than one hundred volumes of the *Archives*, which are quarto and printed in double columns. This will serve to give an idea of the magnitude of the task undertaken by M. Jaurès's commission.

A considerable number of the local cahiers have been issued from time to time by individuals and by local historical societies, but the commission proposes to make their collection complete and include all those already published in the *Archives Parlementaires* or elsewhere. The work has been carefully divided among departmental committees, and several of these are nearly ready to issue the cahiers of their several districts. Years will probably elapse, however, before the whole series is completed.<sup>3</sup>

The second great undertaking of the commission is the collection and publication of the data relating to the very fundamental but vexed question of the extent and disposal of the *biens nationaux*, that is to say, the property of the clergy, monks, ecclesiastical organizations, and émigrés, as well as that included in the king's domain, all of which was taken over by the state early in the Revolution. It is clear that the economic and social effects of the confiscation and

<sup>1</sup> See article and references by Onou, "La Valeur des Cahiers de 1789", *La Révolution Française*, November, 1905 (XLIX. 385-417).

<sup>2</sup> Brette, "Les Cahiers de 1789 et les 'Archives Parlementaires'", *ibid.*, July, 1904 (XLVII. 5-27).

<sup>3</sup> An excellent brief study of the main contentions of the cahiers is that of Edme Champion, *La France d'après les Cahiers de 1789* (1897). Here, pp. 7-8, and in the *Cambridge Modern History*, VIII. 802 et seqq., one may find partial lists of the collections of local cahiers which have been issued.

hasty disposal of so considerable a part of the landed possessions of France must have been momentous. This agrarian revolution is still frequently referred to in the current debates, but the discussion is based upon very insufficient material, and there continues to be much uncertainty as to whether the peasant or the bourgeoisie gained more by the redistribution, and as to what effect this exercised upon the increase of small holdings.<sup>1</sup>

The inventories of the various confiscated holdings, which the commission proposes to publish, will furnish for the first time an adequate basis for estimating the extent and value of the ecclesiastical property at the end of the Ancien Régime, about which there has been so much speculation. The circumstances of the sale of the property by the government will serve to determine the exact destination of the lands.<sup>2</sup>

It is clear that the classes of sources to which the commission will give preference are those of official authenticity. Indeed the tendency to relegate the formerly highly esteemed personal *mémoires* to a subordinate place among the sources is a marked scientific achievement of recent years. Official registers, *procès-verbaux*, reports of committees, letters, diaries, all must take precedence in the matter of accuracy to personal reminiscences, usually written long after the events to which they refer.<sup>3</sup>

The conception of history underlying the vast project of M. Jaurès and his colleagues naturally suggests a consideration of the tendencies which may be distinguished in the treatment of material already at hand. As Carlyle said long ago, the words "French Revolution" may "have as many meanings as there are speakers of them". To him it meant "the open, violent rebellion and victory of disimprisoned anarchy against corrupt, worn-out authority; how anarchy breaks prison, bursts up from the infinite deep, and rages uncontrollable, immeasurable, enveloping a world; in phasis after phasis of fever-frenzy".<sup>4</sup> By Taine the Revolution is likened to the disorders produced in a gentleman "rather weak in constitution but apparently sound and of peaceful habits who drinks eagerly of a new liquor, falls suddenly to the ground, foaming at the mouth,

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Loutchisky began the scientific study of this matter in his *La Petite Propriété en France avant la Révolution et la Vente des Biens Nationaux* (Paris, 1897).

<sup>2</sup> The directions issued by the commission to the local committees in regard to the method of collecting and arranging the material may be found in *La Révolution Française*, December, 1905 (XLIX. 537-547).

<sup>3</sup> Taine's reckless use of worthless sources has been illustrated recently by Belloc, "Ten Pages of Taine", *The International Quarterly*, XII. 255-272 (January, 1906).

<sup>4</sup> *French Revolution*, sections 456-457 (book VI., ch. 1).

delirious and convulsed".<sup>1</sup> Neither Carlyle nor Taine took his imagery so seriously as to miss some of the deeper significance of the Revolution; but weaker heads than theirs have been completely bewildered by the loud talk and disorder of the period, which they have mistaken for the Revolution itself. One of the most striking achievements of the last quarter of a century is the relegation of the Reign of Terror to its proper place. The English-reading public have Professor Morse Stephens in especial to thank for explaining and reducing to its proper proportions the disimprisoned anarchy, which indeed seems almost trivial when compared with the magnificent turmoil in Russia at the present moment.

The merely personal has always been conspicuous in the histories of the Revolution. Marie Antoinette, the Princess de Lamballe, Marat, Charlotte Corday, Desmoulins, Danton, Saint-Just, the poor little dauphin—these have been dear to the hearts of readers whose interest was much more readily enlisted in the storming of the Bastille than in the establishment of the present departments of France or the origin of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The picturesque, the gruesome, the anecdotal, are all falling into the background and giving place to the fundamental and permanent results of the general movement.

These fundamental changes belong, however, to the most varied classes. The political have naturally received early and constant attention. Much prominence has been given to the formation and dissolution of the successive parties in the successive governmental bodies and to the complexion of the political clubs and the rôle of the journalists. These have perhaps formed the core of the more serious general accounts of the Revolution, and M. Aulard has just given us a new and excellent review of the period from a political standpoint.<sup>2</sup> Yet much of the political agitation was very superficial; and, unless taken in connection with the deeper special issues, it is bound to attract less and less attention as the actors in the drama lose their personal interest for us.

Somewhat akin to the political aspects of the Revolution are the diplomatic, for which many historians, recently most conspicuously M. Sorel, have exhibited a marked penchant. There is no reason why the main outlines of negotiations during the long wars which began in April, 1792, should not be pretty clear by this time, since they have long been receiving careful attention from German and Austrian scholars as well as French. Sorel's extraordinary work upon Europe and the French Revolution,<sup>3</sup> which has just been

<sup>1</sup> *Ancien Régime*, liv. III., ch. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française, 1789-1804* (1901).

<sup>3</sup> *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, eight vols. (coming down to 1815), 1885-1904.

brought to completion, is characterized by scholarship and literary finish. It combines most happily the internal history of France with a discussion of the broader influences of the revolutionary movement throughout Europe, and should completely replace Sybel's ill-balanced and partizan work, which unfortunately enjoys a reputation which it ill deserves.

I will say nothing about the progress in military history. The whole matter of the Revolutionary wars is being once more reviewed by M. Chuquet,<sup>1</sup> who seems to be the Jomini of our day. Fighting has a perennial fascination for many minds, and no one questions its importance when properly treated, but military history easily degenerates into as episodal and personal a chronicle as the old-fashioned annals of the king's court.

Of the really living issues bequeathed by the Revolution to France of to-day, three are easily distinguishable by reason of the never-ending discussion to which they give rise: first, the question of the relations between the civil and ecclesiastical organizations; second, and closely allied with the first, the problem of education and of the monastic orders; and lastly, the economic troubles, which are not of course peculiar to France, but which are there always considered in relation with the vital changes introduced by the legislation of the Revolution.

Among these changes none was more momentous than the reform of that ancient ecclesiastical organization which had continued to perpetuate many medieval traits flagrantly out of accord with the spirit and conditions of the eighteenth century. The exact nature and effects of the reforms in the Church have however been obscured both by our ignorance of the exact condition of the clergy and the institutions and property which they controlled before 1790, and by the violent religious prejudices which have dominated many writers. The extreme clerical party, on the one hand, has always been prone to mistake an objection to an impropriated tithe for a rejection of Christianity; and, on the other hand, the anticlericals have allowed themselves to be completely blinded to the greatness and beneficence of the Church by their well-founded conviction that the clergy have frequently stood out for the most ancient and obvious abuses.

The material for judging of the nature and extent of the Church's influence in the eighteenth century is still very incomplete. The publication of the local cahiers and of the documents relating to the Church property will do much to remedy the de-

<sup>1</sup>*Les Guerres de la Révolution, 1886 et seqq.*; eleven volumes have appeared, coming down to the end of 1793.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—36.

ficiency, although there must be a great deal more material both of a local and of a general nature which should be made available. Such material as exists has been utilized rather recently by Abbé Sicard in his "Bishops before the Revolution",<sup>1</sup> written in a spirit of warm admiration. The rôle of the parish priests in the elections of 1789, and the nature of their criticisms on the existing system, are treated by Chassin in his useful little book, *Les Cahiers des Curés* (1882).

With an all too inadequate background of knowledge of the conditions which determined the reforms of the Constituent Assembly, a number of accounts of the changes themselves have appeared of recent years. Some of these are scarcely more than political pamphlets called forth by the active discussion which has been carried on in regard to the "congrégations" and the state support of the churches. Others are serious and scholarly historical contributions. Theiner long ago made a collection of documents relating to religious affairs in France from 1790 to 1800.<sup>2</sup> This has been supplemented by Dr. Robinet's *Le Mouvement Religieux à Paris pendant la Révolution* (2 vols., 1896-1898). This was interrupted by the editor's death, and comes down only to September, 1793.<sup>3</sup>

Of the recent treatments of the Church, the following written from quite different standpoints may be noted<sup>4</sup>: Debidour, well known for his diplomatic history of the nineteenth century, has written a companion volume, *Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870* (1898). Toward two hundred pages of this have to do with the period before the Concordat of 1801, and furnish bibliographies of the sources and older works. Professor Sloane in *The French Revolution and Religious Reform* (based on the Morse Lectures for 1900) gives the English-reading public the first scholarly account of the ecclesiastical legislation from 1789 to 1804 and its influence upon France. Aulard has followed up his earlier study on the worship of reason (1892) by *La Révolution Française et les Congrégations* (mainly documents, 1903); and by articles in the recent issues of his periodical, *La Révolution Française* (August to November, 1905), on the separation of Church

<sup>1</sup> *L'Ancien Clergé de France*, vol. I. (1893), *Les Évêques avant la Révolution*. Volumes II.-III., since published, relate to the Revolutionary period (1894, 1903).

<sup>2</sup> Augustin Theiner, *Documents Inédits relatifs aux Affaires Religieuses en France* (2 vols., 1857-1858).

<sup>3</sup> Local documents and records are constantly being published, and it is from these that the most accurate idea of the conditions and course of events must be derived. Delarue, *Le Clergé et le Culte Catholique en Bretagne pendant la Révolution*, vol. I. (1903), is an instance in point.

<sup>4</sup> Among the older accounts those still most useful are, perhaps, Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution Civile du Clergé* (2d ed., 1887), and Gazier, *Études sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française* (1887).

and State. Belonging to the same school, which may rather invidiously be called that of the latter-day Jacobins, we have the elaborate and careful contributions of Mathiez, especially his monograph on theophilanthropy.<sup>1</sup> Special merits attach to the little book of M. Edme Champion, *La Séparation de l'Église et de l'État en 1794* (1903). The author modestly calls this "an introduction to the religious history of the Revolution", but it is a very remarkable summary of the whole movement, and the writer's spirit, knowledge, and graces of style immediately arouse the confidence and admiration of the reader.

In the matter of the history of education during the Revolution the most fundamental progress is being made in the publication by J. Guillaume of the *Procès-verbaux du Comité d'Instruction Publique* of the National Assembly (1 vol.) and of the Convention (of which the fourth volume has recently appeared). The editor has supplied valuable introductions to his material. A recent general review of the theories of education during the Revolution by Maurice Wolff will be found in *L'Œuvre Sociale de la Révolution Française*.<sup>2</sup>

Of late the economic phases of the Ancien Régime and of the Revolution have begun to receive the attention they merit. Tocqueville's few suggestions and the utterly insufficient and superficial chapters in Taine's *Ancien Régime* long represented all that even a careful student looked for to explain the antecedents of the Revolutionary reforms of 1789 and the succeeding years. Now he has at his command a number of special works which make at least a hopeful beginning toward a scientific and adequate picture of the ancient and chaotic conditions with which the National Assembly did battle.

It is to the Russians, singularly enough, that we owe some of the best recent studies upon the economic and administrative concerns of the Ancien Régime. Karéiev published in 1879 in Russian his "Peasants and the Peasant Question in France during the last quarter of the Eighteenth Century". This has been translated into French (1899) and, although unfortunately not brought up to date, is a work of very substantial value.<sup>3</sup> Afanassiev has dealt with

<sup>1</sup> *La Théophilanthropie et le Culte Décadaire, 1796-1801* (1904). The same writer has written on the origins of the Revolutionary worship and other phases of the subject.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, n. d. [1901], a collection of five essays by careful writers, with an introduction by Émile Faguet.

<sup>3</sup> See an excellent review of the volume by Henri Sée in the *Revue Historique*, November-December, 1904 (LXXXVI, 382-386). M. Sée observes that "the history of the rural classes in the eighteenth century still remains to be written". His own work, *Les Classes Rurales et le Régime Domanal en France au Moyen Âge* (1901), is really an invaluable introduction to the study of the Ancien Régime. He believes that "vers le milieu du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, la condition des paysans semble fixée, dans ses traits essentiels, telle qu'elle subsistera jusqu'à la fin de l'Ancien Régime," p. ix.



the important matter of the grain trade in the eighteenth century<sup>1</sup>—markets, their administration and officers, grain dealers, domestic and foreign trade, tolls, dues, etc., and the attempted reforms of Turgot and Necker. Loutchisky, above referred to,<sup>2</sup> has written on the effects of the confiscations. Kovalevsky, who devoted the first volume of his "Origins of Modern Democracy" (Moscow, 1895–1899) to France, is now beginning the publication in French of a work on France upon the eve of the Revolution from an economic and social standpoint.<sup>3</sup> Ardachev has published in Russian a study of the provincial administration which he proposes to reissue in French. As a precursor to this he has already printed (1904) a volume of documents which will form the third volume of the proposed work.<sup>4</sup>

From the pens of French scholars we have the new and "entirely recast" edition of Levasseur's well-known "History of the Working Classes before 1789",<sup>5</sup> in which many pages are assigned to the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. On the gilds Martin-Saint-Léon has added a new monograph of which the latter part has to do with the eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

An especially prominent place should be assigned in this review of the economic literature to the extraordinary work of Charles Gomel. His two volumes on "The Financial Causes of the French Revolution"<sup>7</sup> which relate to Turgot, Necker, and the later controllers-general will do more to dispel the old misapprehensions in regard to the antecedents of the revolutionary movement than any other single history. Gomel conceives his subject very generously, so that in spite of its title his work is perhaps the best general account in existence of the reign of Louis XVI., and should always be included in even the most modest collection of books on the Revo-

<sup>1</sup> Georges Afanassiev, *Le Commerce des Céréales en France au Dix-huitième Siècle* (1804).

<sup>2</sup> Page 537, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *La France Économique et Sociale à la Veille de la Révolution*, the first instalment of which appeared in the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, August–September, 1905.

<sup>4</sup> See an interesting article by Karéiev, "La Révolution Française dans la Science Historique Russe", in *La Révolution Française*, XLII. 321–345. The writer maintains that the interest of Russian scholars is purely scientific and is not the result of the problems which present themselves at home.

<sup>5</sup> *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières et de l'Industrie en France avant 1789* (2d ed., 1900–1901).

<sup>6</sup> *Histoire des Corporations de Métiers depuis leurs Origines jusqu'à leur Suppression en 1791* (1897).

<sup>7</sup> *Les Causes Financières de la Révolution*, I., *Les Ministères de Turgot et de Necker* (1892); II., *Les Derniers Contrôleurs Généraux* (1893): continued under the title *Histoire Financière de l'Assemblée Constituante* (2 vols., 1896–1897) and *Histoire Financière de la Législative et de la Convention* (2 vols., 1902–1905).





[illegible]

lution. The work is distinguished for its perfect clarity, perspective, and fair-mindedness.

Sagnac has pointed out the need for more descriptions of local conditions, for only on them can safe general results be based. The study of the institutions of the Ancien Régime is, he urges, "extrêmement complexe et délicate".<sup>1</sup> Without a minute examination, for instance, of the actual effects of an edict, it is impossible to tell what it meant, whether it was actually promulgated in any particular district, and, if so, whether it was ever executed. As examples of the rapidly increasing number of special studies of this class may be noted the essays of Bloch on the generality of Orleans, 1760-1789 (1900),<sup>2</sup> and the monograph of P. Tézenas de Montcel, which confines itself to the proceedings from October 8, 1787, to July 21, 1790, of one of the local assemblies (that at Saint-Étienne) established by the administrative reform of June 22, 1787<sup>3</sup>. This might easily prove of more value to one striving to acquaint himself with the real character of the old administrative system and the economic problems of the time than all the more general works that have been written.

For the Revolution itself far the most noteworthy general treatment from an economic standpoint is the "Socialist History" by M. Jaurès<sup>4</sup>, whose services in organizing the national commission for the collection of the sources for economic history has already been mentioned. Printed on bad paper, in a form to be cheaply circulated among the peasants and artisans of France, the work might from its title and glaring red covers be mistaken for a gigantic pamphlet. But, on the contrary, it is certainly the best general history of the period which has appeared for many years, perhaps the best that has ever been written. The writer takes advantage of a vast amount of special investigation which was not available for earlier writers, and treats his subject in a spirit of remarkable philosophic fairness. He is clear and orderly in the arrangement of his material, and naturally places the emphasis on many points which have been sadly neglected by those interested chiefly in the political history. It is to be hoped that the exigencies of propaganda will not prevent the

<sup>1</sup> "De la Méthode dans l'Étude des Institutions de l'Ancien Régime", *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, VI. 14 et seqq.

<sup>2</sup> Camille Bloch, *Études sur l'Histoire Économique de la France* (1900).

<sup>3</sup> *L'Assemblée du Département de Saint-Étienne* (1903).

<sup>4</sup> *Histoire Socialiste, 1789-1900*, sous la direction de Jean Jaurès. Volumes I.-IV. (Paris, n. d. [1901 et seqq.]), covering the period to the Ninth Thermidor, are by Jaurès himself. Volume V., from the Ninth Thermidor to the Eighteenth Brumaire, is by Deville. Volume VI., the Consulate and Empire, is by P. Brousse and H. Turot. See a review of this work by Dr. Charles A. Beard in *Political Science Quarterly*, March, 1906.

work from being reprinted in less awkward volumes and on paper which will bring out clearly the numerous and highly interesting illustrations. It would then easily take its place in our libraries among the very best general histories of the French Revolution.<sup>1</sup>

Much more concise than the volumes of Jaurès is M. Aulard's "Political History of the Revolution" (1901), written by one who has given years of attention to the sources of the period and who naturally treats the whole republican movement with the utmost sympathy.<sup>2</sup> This compact and admirable book should be speedily translated into English.

Among the more special accounts of the work of the Revolution may be noted the later volumes of Gomel's *Histoire Financière*, covering the period of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (4 vols.) and ultimately to include the Convention.<sup>3</sup> The sterling merits of this work have already been emphasized. It is by no means a narrowly technical treatise, but takes into consideration all the bearings of the financial policy of the assemblies. This may be supplemented in some respects by Sagnac, *La Législation Civile de la Révolution Française, 1789-1804* (1898). This is devoted largely to the land question and to the laws affecting the family relations, marriages, inheritance, etc. Lastly, the new edition of Levasseur's "History of the Working Classes and Industry from 1789 to 1870" (1903-1904) gives much attention to the assignats and other important topics.<sup>4</sup>

Besides the general and special treatments of the Revolution from the religious, educational, and economic or social standpoint, two other classes of contributions are becoming more and more numerous as the demand for accurate and intensive historical investigation develops. One is the monograph which confines itself

<sup>1</sup> I think that some years ago M. Sorel remarked that he considered Louis Blanc's *Histoire de la Révolution Française* (Paris, 12 vols., 1847-1862) on the whole the best general account of the Revolution. That of Jaurès is far superior in all respects except in his omission of exact citations, which would have encumbered his text with foot-notes which few of those readers to whom he wished especially to appeal would have appreciated.

<sup>2</sup> See page 538, note 2. The attitude of the modern sympathizer with the Revolution is well expressed by M. Seligman as follows: "Les souffrances des victimes innocentes [of the Revolutionary tribunals] furent la rançon des progrès qui nous furent légués. Il nous appartient, à nous qui les voyons de loin, de réconcilier ces grands ancêtres dans une pieuse et filiale reconnaissance"—whatever that may mean. From an address at Liège, June, 1905, reported in *La Révolution Française*, October, 1905 (XLIX. 361).

<sup>3</sup> See page 542, note 7.

<sup>4</sup> There is a remarkable chronological table of the edicts, decrees, ordonnances, laws, etc., issued in regard to economic matters (I. lxxxii), which gives a vivid impression of the range and activity of the Revolutionary legislation compared with that of the earlier period.

to the events of a single noteworthy day or some one factor in the general situation, the other class is the local history which exhibits the origin and course of the revolutionary movement in a small district. We have books on the Fourteenth of July, the Tenth of August, the theatres, the press, the émigrés, the buildings occupied at different times by the parliamentary assemblies, the "grand peur" in Dauphiné. Ferdinand-Dreyfus has written on public relief under the Legislative Assembly and the Convention; Seligman on the administration of justice, 1789-1792 (1901); Lenôtre on the guillotine<sup>1</sup> and arrests during the Revolution.

Of the local histories recently published, that of Bruneau, *Les Débuts de la Révolution dans les Départements du Cher et de l'Indre, 1789-1791* (1902), is a study of the old province of Berry. By means of investigations such as this one can form a very exact idea of the collapse of the old government, the advent of the new provisional substitute, the progress and effects of the sale of the public lands, the issuing of the assignats. The third part of Bussière's "Historical Studies on the Revolution in Périgord" has appeared (1903). There is now a long list of similar works, some of them in several volumes. A well-chosen group of them should be in every library that aims to keep pace with the literature of the Revolution; for it is in such works, as has already been said, that one may discover the true secret of the Revolution in its influence upon the life of the common lot.<sup>2</sup>

Before bringing to a close this rather arid but perhaps useful review of the vast range and compass of activity in the field of Revolutionary history, it is natural to ask whether in view of all that has been done and all that is planned in the way of special investigation it is possible even to conceive of an adequate general review of the Revolution such as used to be undertaken with a light heart. As early as 1797 a writer on the causes and results of the Revolution declared that it was "a complete change of manners, customs, conditions, and possessions".<sup>3</sup> Such a proposition could only be proved or disproved, as we now clearly see, after a detailed examination of the manners, customs, conditions, and property-holding not only of the Revolution but of the Ancien Régime. Material for such an

<sup>1</sup> In his interesting studies, *Paris Révolutionnaire: Vieilles Maisons, Vieux Papiers* (2 vols., 1904).

<sup>2</sup> The appearance of local histories and of other monographs can be conveniently followed in *La Révolution Française*, and in the admirable *Répertoire Méthodique de l'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, edited by Brière and Caron, which, beginning with an account of the output of the year 1898, has been appearing annually since 1900.

<sup>3</sup> Lezay-Marnézia, *Des Causes de la Révolution et de ses Résultats* (Paris, 1797), 6, quoted by Chassin, *Le Génie de la Révolution*, vii.

examination is only beginning to be collected, and it seems therefore impossible to determine for a long time to come what exactly were the effects of the Revolutionary changes.

But however incomplete and provisional our histories of the Revolution may be until the whole range of changes is examined and the results of the examination digested, they will hereafter be free from the influence of four fallacies which have wrought much evil in the past: first, the long-cherished belief that the Revolution began on May 5, 1789; second, that it culminated in the Reign of Terror; third, that it was confined mainly to the city of Paris; and lastly, that its history can be written from that older form of historical fiction, personal memoirs. All these convictions are being surrendered by careful scholars. The Reign of Terror no longer claims the attention of many investigators; and the provinces, as has been abundantly shown, are vying with Paris in bringing to light material relating to local history and in producing monographs and elaborate histories of all parts of the ancient kingdom. Memoirs are regarded now with rooted suspicion, and preference is always given to strictly contemporaneous reports and proceedings. The fatal date 1789 continues, however, to bar the way to a complete grasp of the unity of the revolutionary movement. Histories still close or commence with that year, although it was assuredly in 1786, when Calonne threw up his hands and summoned the Notables, that the Revolution as an unbroken political movement took its beginning.

It is high time that we had a general account of the Revolution regarded simply and solely in its most fundamental aspects as a reformation, social, political, and economic. This is what Chassin evidently had in mind when he began his never-completed "*Genius of the Revolution*". He dreamed of an "*histoire positive*", in which the personal, anecdotal, transient, and fantastic should give way to the permanent achievements of the time.<sup>1</sup> By the term "*Revolution*" Chassin understood not the upbubbling of disimprisoned anarchy, but quite prosaically the way in which the reformers transformed their ideas into acts: how they substituted for a polity based upon privilege, the régime of equality; for despotism, a free state; for divine right, the sovereignty of the people; for favor, justice. Assuredly, as Chassin ventured to think, "*cette histoire ne gagnerait-elle pas en certitude ce qu'au premier aspect elle semblerait perdre en intérêt?*" But no apologies are necessary.

This ideal, it seems to the present writer, is most nearly realized by M. Gomet.<sup>2</sup> Although he claims to deal only with the financial

<sup>1</sup> *Le Génie de la Révolution* (1864-1865), introduction. Only the first part, on the cahiers of 1789, in two volumes, ever appeared.

<sup>2</sup> See above, page 542, note 7, and page 544.



*et cetera et omnia in hoc Sum.*

1. 凡在本行開辦之各項業務，均應遵守本行所定之各項規章，不得有違。

**T**HIS is to let all persons know that I fully intend to sell all my peell farms of lands that I hold by lease or deed, in North-Carolina, which is one hundred and fifty acres in Cr Shaw county, all in one body, the lower Jersey including with all the facilities there belonging; and also nine hundred acres in Anson county, if purchasers will appear the whole within one month, and that for no other reason than I was to make a division amongst my children, which I live, if God will permit.

I will give the bell of rights and titles that the province will afford to the purchaser, or purchasers. Also a number of household furniture too tedious to mention; thirty with a number of hays; several yokes of oxen, with a number of cattle, and all utensils entirely new belonging to the said farm, and some work horses, &c. and several little conveniences &c. &c.

by this day, and several likely persons &c. &c.

if he fails to begin, if my lot should remain, on the

first day of March next, up, which will be in the year of our Lord 1724, and to continue daily till the whole be sold. Twelve months credit will be given to the purchasers with approved security to the subscriber or his heirs, so as he will direct at the time of sale. All for a under ten pounds price, money to be paid down at the time of sale. I intend to get as low a price as I can for the venue master and all persons who have any demands against me are desired to bring in the same and I will discharge them, or forever bar their peace, and all time involved to me are desired to make payment by the time of sale, otherwise I will, in the hands of an attorney.

<sup>1</sup>Onflow, Dec. 23, 1771. JOHN WILKINS

One Hundred Pounds Reward.

SUPPOSED to be stolen or inveigled about July 17-18, on the road leading from a river to my late shore plantation on Waccamaw neck near by opposite to George Town, a sensible old negro man named Hector, about six feet high, much pitted with the small-pox and speaks very good English, and his son Carlos, a very likely mulatto boy about seven years old. There is reason to believe they were carried off by some flagrant white men, who went, about that time, through this into the North province.

A reward of 100l currency or 25l proc money will be paid on conviction of the offenders, and delivery of the slaves to John Anselm Esq. in Wilmington Cape Fear, or to me. And whoever will inform where these negroes are so that they can be secured for their masters, shall receive a reward of fifty pounds currency.

Robert Heriot.  
Columbia, S. Carolina, Dec. 12.

George Town, N. Carolina, Dec. 1861

To be sold for cash or on short credit with approved guaranty.

...and they're healthy, fun-loving people, who

have been accustomed to plantation beliefs, &

...will acquiesced with every branch of it.

Inquire of A. BOYD

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1033-1036.

ED BY UNZ.ORG

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



*Yngl. Martins (1739) 28<sup>th</sup> August 1775.*  
THE  
**CAPE-FEAR MERCURY.**

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1775.

[No. 266.]

**A CIRCULAR LETTER**

To the COMMITTEES of SOUTH-CAROLINA.

Charlestown, June 30, 1775.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

**T**HIS year will be a grand epocha in the history of mankind. In this conspicuous and ever-memorable year, America has been abused, and Britain has disgraced herself, in an unexampled manner. All the guilt of all the English ministers of state, from the reign of the First William, to the conclusion of the late war, does not equal the guilt that British ministers have incurred since the latter period. The measure of their iniquity appears now full. They seem fixed in the pursuit of their plan to enslave America, in order that they might enslave Great-Britain; to elevate the monarch, that has been placed on a throne only to govern under the law—into a throne above all law. But, divine providence has inspired the Americans with such virtue, courage, and conduct, as has already attracted the attention of the universe, and will make them famous to the latest posterity. The Americans promise to air the hand of tyranny, and to save even Britannia from shackles.

In a former letter we declared to you, that there was but little probability of deciding the present unhappy public disputes, by the pacific measures we have hitherto pursued. Our ideas were just, and with the deepest grief, yet firmest resolution, we now announce to you, that the sword of civil war, is not only actually drawn, but raised with blood! The king's troops have as length commenced hostilities against this continent; and not confining their ungenerous attacks, against men in arms defending their properties, they have slaughtered the unarmed, the sick, the helpless: having long maliciously oppressed, they have now massacred our fellow-subjects in Massachusetts-Bay. Mark the event! These enormities were formerly perpetrated, when the divine vengeance pursued the guilty, even from the time up to the sun, until the going down of the same: the king's troops were discomfited, they fled before our injured friends; the night saved them from total destruction.

But how, in what manner the American civil war commenced; and we lay before you the case, as stated by general Gage on the one part, and by the voice of America on the other.

The general sent a detachment of about 800 soldiers into the country, to seize and destroy the property of the people of the Massachusetts-Bay. This detachment, in their way to Concord, at Lexington, saw "about 200 men drawn up on a green, and when the troops came within 100 yards of them (a situation out of the line of their march) they began to fire off." The soldiers upon observing this, "ran after them; to surround and disarm them. Some of them, who had jumped over a wall, then fired four or five shot at the troops," and, "upon this," the soldiers "began a scattered fire, and killed several of the country people." Clear as it is, even from this flow, that the king's troops, by running after, actually attacked the provincials peaceably firing off; yet general Gage has the integrity to enoble his narrative of this unfortunate affair, "a circumstantial account of an attack on his majesty's troops by a number of the people of Massachusetts-Bay." But men will credibly be surprised at this, when they are told the general makes no attempt to relate even a soldier engaged in the attack. After the general's defeated troops returned to Boston, he declared, that if the inhabitants of that de-

voted city would deliver up their arms, he would permit them to retire from the town, with their effects. They delivered up near 3000 stand of arms—and to this day, they are, in shameful breach of the capitulation, detained in captivity, patiently enduring the calamities of famine.

However, the voice of America thus describes the commencement of this unnatural war: about eight or nine hundred soldiers came in fight, just before sunrise, of about 100 men, training themselves to arms, as usual; and the troops running within a few rods of them, the commanding officer called out to the militia, "disperse you rebels, damn you, throw down your arms and disperse." Upon which the troops huzzas—immediately one or two officers discharged their pistols, and then there seemed to be a general discharge from the whole body. Eight Americans were killed upon the spot, and nine were wounded. The soldiers, in a few minutes, returned their march to Concord; and there, specifically destroyed a considerable quantity of flour and other stores belonging to the public. Another party of militia, about 150 men, alarmed at such violence, had assembled near a village at Concord. The soldiers fired upon them, and killed two men. It was this repeated act of deadly hostility that roused the Americans to repel force by force. They now returned the fire—beat the king's troops out of the town, and compelled them to retreat to Lexington, where they met a reinforcement of 2000 militia men, and two pieces of cannon. The militia being, by this time, increased in their numbers, they dislodged the troops from this post; who, during the remainder of the day, made a precipitate retreat through the American fire, and gained a place of safety under cover of the night: in this battle of Lexington, the Americans had 30 men killed, and 49 wounded. The king's troops lost 160 men, killed, wounded, and missing; and, by subsequent accounts, it appears that, in consequence of that action, general Gage's army has sustained a diminution of 1000 men, by death, wounds, prisoners, desertion, fatigue, and other incapacities of service. For the troops being forty-and-twenty hours on duty, marched, fought, and fled, 43 miles in that time, without the least refreshment. Let it be remembered, that these 1300 British regulars, consisting of the picked men of the whole army—grenadiers, light infantry, and marines, carefully prepared for the expedition, were defeated and driven, by about 1200 American militia, brought to repel an unexpected attack, and marched in accidental parties upon the spur of the occasion. Let it be delivered down to posterity, that the American civil war broke out on the 19th day of April, 1775.—An epoch that, in all probability, will mark the declension of the British empire!

Such an important event as the actual commencement of civil war, caused the convention of the congress, on the first of June; in order, that some provision might be made against impending calamities. The congress held on the 22d instant; and it is our duty to inform you, and through you, the public at large, of the material transactions of this important session.

As a first step for our defence, it was thought expedient to unite the inhabitants of the colony, "as a band in her defence against every foe," and to this purpose, on the fourth day of June, immediately after the celebration of divine service, in consequence an association was signed by all the members present, solemnly engaging their lives and fortunes. In the space of four days, the association was voluntarily subscribed by almost every inhabitant in Charlestown, and transmitted into the country.



history, he really furnishes an admirable review of the whole reform movement beginning with the period of the Seven Years' War and coming down without a break through the administrations of Turgot, Necker, and the later *contrôleurs* to the National Assembly and the Convention. There is no break; the stream is perfectly continuous. Sagnac's "*History of the Civil Legislation*,"<sup>1</sup> while dealing with only a few subjects of reform, is in the same line, as is Levasseur's "*History of the Working Classes*"<sup>2</sup> and the little volume of essays on the "*Social Task of the Revolution*", which has a very suggestive introductory essay by Émile Faguet.

In short, we need a pragmatic history of the Revolution. We long to know just what was actually accomplished. But in order to learn what was done and so appreciate properly the place of the Revolution among the great transformations of history, it will be necessary to bring the history of France from 1789 to 1800 into organic relation not only with the Ancien Régime but with the developments throughout Western Europe of the half-century immediately preceding the assembling of the Estates General. The older writers tended to give preference in their study of the Ancien Régime to the spectacular abuses and the eccentricities of speculation, which may indeed serve to explain the attitude of some of the more fantastic terrorists, but which will never account for the abrupt and permanent betterment. This must remain a mystery to those who have not traced the more or less abortive reforms and the irresistible demands for improvement which lie back of the cahiers of 1789. The Revolution will some day be recognized as fundamentally the most decisive and general readjustment to meet new and altered conditions of which we have any record. To tell the story of this rebirth, not only in France but in Western Europe, by first following out with scrupulous care the process of gestation, is the aspiration which, it is safe to prophesy, will dominate the historiography of the future.

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON.

<sup>1</sup> See above, page 544.

<sup>2</sup> See above, page 542, note 5, and page 544.

<sup>3</sup> See above, page 541, note 2.

## DR. S. MILLINGTON MILLER AND THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION

[IN the exposure of Dr. Miller's interesting fabrication there have been two marked stages. In the period from the time of its publication to December 30, 1905, the leading part in the attack was taken by Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., Secretary of the Historical Commission of South Carolina, who assailed it in the *Columbia State* of July 30, and in the pamphlet mentioned below. From December 30 on, in consequence of Dr. Miller's exhibition of his document on that day, the leading part naturally fell to Mr. Worthington C. Ford, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress. At the request of the managing editor, these two gentlemen have kindly furnished the REVIEW with accounts of the first and second acts of the comedy respectively. The ancient question of the Mecklenburg Declaration, it is perhaps needless to say, remains where it stood before, except that Dr. Miller's efforts have resulted in awakening renewed interest in it and in eliciting some new bits of evidence. Our thanks are due to the editor of *Collier's* for permission to reproduce the original photograph first printed in their pages (plate I., *post*)<sup>1</sup>; to Mr. Salley for plate II.; to the authorities of the Public Record Office, Messrs. B. F. Stevens and Brown of London, and Mr. Alexander Graham of Charlotte, North Carolina, for plates III. and IV.—ED.]

### I.

ON April 30, 1819, the *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*,<sup>2</sup> of Raleigh, North Carolina, published a set of resolutions that were alleged to have been passed in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, by a convention, on May 20, 1775, and that had been rewritten from memory by John McKnitt Alexander, terming them a "Declaration of Independence". A controversy over their genuineness was immediately started and has never ended. The latest attempt to prove them genuine was made by "S. Millington Miller, M.D." in an article on the Mecklenburg "Declaration" which he contributed to the issue of *Collier's* for July 1, 1905. It was an elaborate but vain attempt to deceive the public by a fac-

<sup>1</sup>We regret to find that the reduction in size has entailed some loss of clearness.

<sup>2</sup>On file in the Library of Congress.

simile of an alleged contemporary newspaper containing the alleged "Declaration of Independence".

There is in the British Public Record Office in London a letter written by Governor Josiah Martin of North Carolina on June 30, 1775, to the Earl of Dartmouth, British Secretary of State for the American Department, in which Governor Martin referred to the "Resolves of the Committee of Mecklenburg" which his lordship would find in a newspaper which the governor enclosed in the letter.<sup>1</sup> This newspaper is missing from the letter, and written across the back of the letter is this pencilled note: "A printed paper taken out by Mr. Turner for Mr. Stevenson, August 15, 1837". Mr. Stevenson was then United States minister to England. Miller has produced a paper which he claims to have found among some papers left by Mr. Stevenson, and succeeded in imposing a photograph of it upon the editors of *Collier's* as a photograph of a genuine issue of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* of "Friday, June 3RD, 1775". His date was derived from a tradition held in North Carolina that the paper borrowed by Stevenson was the *Cape-Fear Mercury* of June 3, 1775.

As soon as the writer saw Miller's article in *Collier's*, he became convinced that there was something wrong with the alleged contemporary newspaper. It was not like any of the many contemporary newspapers he had seen; and he began to investigate. The history of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* being easily obtained, he soon produced absolute proof of the spuriousness of Miller's facsimile, which proof he has recently printed in pamphlet form.<sup>2</sup> The part of that pamphlet essential to an understanding of the forgery is reprinted in the following paragraphs, with a few amendments and additions.

Isaiah Thomas's *History of Printing* fixes Friday, October 13, 1769, as the date of the first issue of the *Cape-Fear Mercury*; and a copy of number 7 thereof for Friday, November 24, 1769, in the library of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts, substantiates Thomas. Counting from Friday to Friday and making no allowance for 1772 as a leap-year, it will be seen that there are 295 Fridays to and including the first Friday in June, 1775, and that that Friday falls on June 3; but allow for twenty-nine days in February, 1772, and it will be seen that the first Friday in June, 1775, fell on the second of the month and not on the third as this spurious paper has it. The manufacturer of that paper miscalculated. Nor did the miscalculation stop on that one item. The

<sup>1</sup> See *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, X. 48.

<sup>2</sup> *The True Mecklenburg "Declaration of Independence"* (Columbia, S. C., 1905).

manufacturer counted the number of weeks, not the number of Fridays (inclusive), and numbered his paper wrong. He numbered it 294. It should have been 295 to have the correct number of Fridays. But the history of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* shows that it was not issued continuously every Friday from October 13, 1769, to June 2, 1775. The following extract from the journal of the Wilmington Committee of Safety for January 30, 1775, shows that the paper had suspended publication at some time prior to the latter date:

Mr. Adam Boyd, having applied for encouragement to his newspaper (some time ago laid aside), it was resolved that the committee . . . would support him on the following terms: That he, Mr. Boyd, should weekly continue a newspaper, denominated the Cape Fear Mercury, of 21 inches wide, 17 inches long, 3 columns on a page, and of the small pica or long primer letter, and in return receive his payment at the following periods, viz: ten shillings at the delivery of the first number, ten shillings at the end of every succeeding six months thereafter.<sup>1</sup>

It now appears, though the fact was doubtless unknown to Miller as to most others, that there are five copies of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* in London. Of these, that of nearest date to Friday, June 2, 1775, is dated Friday, July 28, 1775, exactly eight weeks later, and yet it is number 266 (plate iv.). The three papers of later date in 1775 accord with this in dating and numbering. All five are of two columns to the page, not three.

But the wrong date and the wrong number are not the only evidences of spuriousness on the face of the facsimile of this paper. There are three distinct shades to the paper, marked by clearly defined lines, showing that the cut was made from a photograph of at least three distinct and separate pieces of paper put together. The heading undoubtedly came from a genuine *Cape-Fear Mercury*, but not one of "June 3rd, 1775". A comparison of the cut of the genuine paper in the American Antiquarian Society's library (plate II.) with that in *Collier's* of the spurious paper (plate I.) will show that the latter bears exactly the same stains, specks, typographical defects, etc., as the former, and that the heading of this spurious paper is in fact an altered copy of the genuine one. For instances: the right upper horn of the little ornament over the parenthesis before "Friday" is broken off in both; just to the right of the same parenthesis is a speck that appears on both cuts; just under the "F" is another; inside of the "U" in "Mercury" is another;

<sup>1</sup>S. B. Weeks, *The Press of North Carolina in the Eighteenth Century* (Brooklyn, Hist. Printing Club, 1891), 33.

*Quod verumt asque decens erat*

at rest. It is much in the same

No. 3

To His Excellency William Tishy, Esq.,  
Captain-General, Governor, and Com-  
mander in Chief, in and over his Majes-  
ty's Province of North-Carolina.

*The Address of the Assembly of the said Pro-  
vinces.*

**\$ I E.**

**W**E, his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the members of the all-able of the province of Maryland, do hereby return your Excellency our sincere thanks for your speech at the opening of this session, and beg leave to congratulate your Excellency on your happy return from Virginia to your government.

The information your excellency has given us, that no action is to be taken from the colonies, paying an equal of paper currency at a legal tender, can meet with the approval of the utmost concern, as the interest hereby is, that on the honorable representation of the late assembly, with your excellency's interest at home, which you were pleased to name to us, and which we doubt not, has been most strenuously carried on, for the practice, we should have expected the relief to be necessary to the distressed situation and circumstances of the colony.

We are fully sensible of the necessity of  
 having an agent in England, who may be autho-  
 rized to act in every case, in which the in-  
 terest of the College may be concerned.  
 It is here, therefore, we will proceed to the  
 naming of an agent, in which we  
 have the concurrence of all the other  
 branches of the College, and will make  
 the necessary arrangements for supporting  
 such an establishment.

It is encouraged by an act of parliament to the culture of raw silk in America, is pleasing and agreeable to us, and we assure your excellency, that I shall meet with such further encouragement (consistent with the true interest of this country) as to interesting an object may require.

The making provision of powder and shot for His Majesty's service, and the defence of this government, at this time, when we are enjoying the blessings of civil liberty in us, to say, we humbly apprehend, is by no means necessary, as any one of tax whatsoever upon our powder and shot, necessarily be a discouragement to the same, and of course have such

a tendency as to be prejudicial rather than  
advantageous to the country.

The state of our public funds at no time since the settlement of the colony has required a more strict examination than at present; and we agree with your excellency that a settlement of the public accounts should be forthwith obtained, for as a general rule of them may be made known to the country; and shall be extremely obliged to your excellency for any observations or regulations in the manner of settling the public accounts that you shall be pleased to lay before us, which may tend to render the same free from that obliquity they have hitherto been in.

We shall ever esteem it not only im- possible, but to enquire into, and the how far the loss for the emission of paper cur- rency have had their effect, and in whose hands the funds raised to sink those emis- sions remain.

The intelligence your excellency has received from home, and which you are pleased to communicate to us, regarding the situation of his majesty's present ministry, among no doubt, to propose to parliament to lay any further taxes on America for the purpose of raising a revenue, and their proposing to take off the duties on rum, spirits, paper and colors, is very much against the sense of the nation, and we are sure that the British parliament would be as little disposed to do so, as their friends are entitled to be, who have seen the construction of the British constitution, and have been long conversant with the principles of commerce, and we are sure that we are bound to begin to have the sentiments of the ministry in this particular, coincide with our own.

We sympathize with the unfortunate sufferers in the late storm in general, and with the inhabitants of Newbern in particular. But the calamities, losses and misfortunes, occasioned thereby, being general, we cannot, consistent with the duty we owe our constituents, think of granting them assistance, in preference to any other part of the province, lest, by so doing, we should show a partiality we would ever endeavor to avoid.

To which ADDRESS his excellency was  
pleased to return the following AN-  
SWER

Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives.

Thank you for your congratulations on my return from Virginia to this country. It would have afforded me much pleasure to have been able to visit you.

dissatisfaction if the supply of ammunition for the country, and the assistance for the town of Newbern, which I recommended to you in my speech, had been honored with your approbation!

WILLIAM TRYON.

*Narris-Corallina, Newbern, Dec. 13, 1869*  
Recommended by his Excellency to the  
house of representatives now assembled  
as an object worthy of their attention  
that they take under consideration the  
state of the public revenue, and the reg-  
ular application thereof, for the pur-  
poses to which it is appropriated.

**T**HIS fact is too well known to admit of a denial, that in a long course of years past, great sums of public money have been lost by the negligence or insolvency of sheriffs, and other collectors.

And it is presumed, that in the same course of time, considerable sums have been sunk, after they were lodged in the public treasury, whereof no account has hitherto been made.

A law of this province lately passed, will, if executed with vigor, probably, in a great measure, prevent, for the time to come, the first of these mischief's; and a law to prevent the latter, might be of great public utility, for mankind never part with their money, either for their private, or public benefit, so readily, as when assured that it must be honestly applied for the purposes intended.

Accountant, regular, plain and uniform method of keeping the books, and of charging of the public revenue, and of raising and settling the accounts, may prevent such abuses, and make it extremely difficult, or even impossible, to embezzle the public money.

The house, therefore, will consider it, for the future, the public treasury, and, as such, will be obliged to keep a regular list of all the books in which shall be entered, every particular sum of money received or paid by them on account of the public, with the name of the person from whom such sum received, or in whom paid, as well as the date, and name of the transaction.

A call-book, therefore, that credits  
where the treasury upon one file will  
make him a debtor, for all sums of public  
money paid in to him, and on the other  
file creditor for all sums of public  
money paid out by him, with the dates of  
such receipts and payments; which call-  
book is altogether abstracted from the  
other accounts.





and so on all over the heading. Some apparent effort has been made to remove the larger stains from the altered copy, with the result that the altered copy is blurred or scratched at every single point where these stains show up clearly in the unchanged copy. It is well known to several people in Worcester that S. Millington Miller was in Worcester a short time before this article appeared in *Collier's* and that he visited the library of the American Antiquarian Society, and it is also known that the Society's copy of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* was photographed for him prior to the appearance of his article in *Collier's*. The following letter will throw some light on the matter:

PHOTOGRAPHERS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND  
Office of the First Vice-President

Mr. A. S. Salley,  
Columbia, S. C.                      Worcester, Mass., Nov. 13, 1905.

My Dear Sir:—

Your inquiry of the 11th inst. to hand. I did make a copy of the Cape Fear Mercury for S. Millington Miller, but for some reason he wanted a reverse negative made—and in doing this there might have been a slight deviation from the exact size<sup>1</sup>, but in your copy I feel quite sure that the dimensions are exactly the size of the original, as I was very particular about the size.<sup>2</sup> I thank you for giving me cr. for the copy in your reproduction.

Very truly yours,

J. CHESTER BUSHONG  
No. 6 Elm St.

The metal in the electroplate loaned the writer for his pamphlet by *Collier's* shows up brighter where the erasures were made on Mr. Bushong's photograph or negative. The next photograph and the equally faithful half-tone made therefrom and the electroplate made from that all preserve the truth quite plainly.

That the date of the genuine paper was altered for the reproduction is quite evident. "June 3RD" is not in the usual type used for printing the months in the *Mercury's* date-line; it is not in the same type as "November 24" in the genuine paper. The "J" and "une" are not in the same relative proportion as the "N" and "ovember". The "RD" is in small capitals, which were seldom or never used in date abbreviations in the body of a newspaper then and are not used now—always lower-case letters—and it was not the style of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* to use figures followed by "rd" or "th" in the date-line; a comma was all that was used, but the

<sup>1</sup> The dimensions given by Miller in *Collier's* are 8¾ by 13¾.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. E. M. Barton, the librarian of the American Antiquarian Society, confirms Mr. Bushong. The writer has a letter from him stating that the photograph made by Mr. Bushong for the writer was made the exact size of the paper, namely, 8¾ by 13¾.

"RD" in small capitals appears to have been used in this case to fill up an awkward space. The "Friday" and the "1775" occupy exactly the same positions on this paper that they do on the Antiquarian Society's paper. "June 3," is not so long as "November 24," and would leave an awkward space which the "RD" in small capitals, followed by the comma, helps to fill up for the sake of appearance. Besides, the appearance of the electroplate indicates that a change was made on the original photograph or the negative thereof before being reproduced. This does not show in the print as it does on the electroplate made from previous reproductions. The "75" in "1775" is also in a different type from the "17"; the "5" is awry; and the "2" in "294" is in a different type from the "9" and the "4".

Another significant fact is that the copies of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* that are in London, issued in 1775 (e. g., plate iv.), are without the royal arms of Great Britain and the Latin motto that appear on the heading of the paper issued in 1769 that is in the library of the American Antiquarian Society. The same types were used for the title, however.

Again, the types in the first two columns appended to this heading are different. The type of the Mecklenburg "Declaration" in the first column are apparently modern type, and are smaller and trimmer than the type of the second column, which are the clumsy-looking type of the Revolutionary period. The second column was apparently taken from a paper published just after the Lexington and Concord fights, in April, 1775, giving the casualties of those fights. The small piece of this column preserved in the cut in *Collier's* is exactly—punctuation and all—like the account of those fights published in Almon's *Remembrancer*. But the names are in italics in the *Remembrancer*, and its account was doubtless copied from an earlier paper; and it was probably from that earlier paper that Miller cut the account and used the first of it to fill up his first column below his Mecklenburg "Declaration" and continued it on his second column. We are uninformed as to what constituted his third column, for the editors of *Collier's* cut off from their photograph all but the heading, the "Declaration" and four lines of its alleged list of signers, and the small piece of the second column shown in the cut. Another striking coincidence is that when Miller was in Charlotte in the spring of 1905 he was shown a copy of Almon's *Remembrancer* containing this account of the Concord and Lexington fights, and tried to buy it.

The first column, which contains only the first three of the five resolves of the alleged Mecklenburg "Declaration" of May 20, with

the names appended of the chairman, secretary, and others of the alleged members of the convention, was evidently set up for the especial purpose of making this very column, and was then printed off on a well "doctored" piece of paper. It was set in modern type, and as the font evidently contained no old-fashioned long "s" (which resembles an "f"), a modern "f" was used in lieu thereof. The difference is apparent. The bar at right angles to the perpendicular extends from the left across to the right of the perpendicular in the "f"; it stops at the perpendicular of the old-style "s." This alleged contemporary print of the Mecklenburg "Declaration" faithfully follows in capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and the arrangement of the names of the alleged signers of the "Declaration" (save that the lines of the Chairman and the Secretary are reversed, while they retain their proper positions on those lines) a broadside printed in Joseph Johnson's *Traditions and Reminiscences of the Revolution* in 1851, which did not pretend to be a copy from the original "Declaration", but is now known to be a copy of another broadside of the "Declaration", manufactured about 1825, and presenting a list of the alleged signers. Mr. Alexander's memory could not possibly have been so accurate as to have enabled him to remember the very spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and arrangement of a paper he had not seen in many years; and it is also a significant fact that when Miller was in Charlotte in the spring of 1905 he was presented with one of these broadsides.

These several pieces of paper were placed in juxtaposition and photographed, and the first and second columns were not so placed as to make their perpendicular lines of type exactly parallel.

If the controversy over the Mecklenburg "Declaration of Independence" is ever settled, it will have to be done by genuine contemporary documents and not by spurious ones like this.

A. S. SALLEY, JR.

## II.

BEING asked by a member of the North Carolina Historical Commission to give my opinion of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* of June 3, 1775, which Dr. S. Millington Miller was holding for sale, I went to Baltimore on the morning of December 30 under an arrangement with the three gentlemen representing North Carolina, namely, Dr. George W. Graham, Mr. Alexander Graham, and Mr. R. O. Alexander. Under a plea of an important engagement Miller left the city before I arrived, but agreed to "endeavor to secure" my opinion "by a direct written request upon him [me] within five days of this date." The committee reported that Miller showed to them a two-

columned paper (that reproduced in *Collier's* being one of three columns, see plate 1.), and specified that the word "Medford" was printed in the third line from the top of the second column in Miller's sheet, whereas the Collier facsimile gave the second syllable of the word, "ford", as the first word of the second column. Further, to Mr. Waldo G. Leland, who accompanied me to Baltimore, and who has shown a keen and intelligent interest in the subject, the committee gave definite points upon the water-mark of the paper, the repairs upon it, and the general appearance of the sheet, which formed the basis of questions to Dr. Miller in my talks with him.

On December 30, Dr. Miller wrote that he would see me on one of three days he named, and I at once named Friday, January 5. I was with him for an hour and a half on Friday and nearly two hours and a half on Saturday, with his *Cape-Fear Mercury* before me. My questions were all framed with an idea to show how and when he obtained this paper. I was obliged to conclude that his statements are entirely unreliable, and that he was offering a paper which he knew to be a forgery, and of which he was presumably the forger. The most puzzling feature in the matter, however, lay in the definite statement of the three gentlemen from North Carolina that he showed to them in Baltimore a two-columned paper. It was a three-columned paper that I saw, and the water-mark, the repairs, and the location of the word "Medford" all corresponded to what the committee saw. Even if they had told Miller what points they thus especially noted, and they assure me that they did not, it was a physical impossibility for him to have manufactured a new sheet in the interval of five days, with like points. Inasmuch as Miller in all probability had taken the copy of the *Cape-Fear Mercury* at Worcester (plate II.) as his model (a three-columned paper), there was no reason for his submitting a two-columned sheet. The committee did have in their possession photographs of two-columned *Mercurys* for 1773 and 1775, obtained from London (plates III. and IV.), and may have confused their impressions of what they did see. In justice to them it may be said that all three reiterated their statement of a two-columned paper in Miller's hands when by telegraph I called attention to the discrepancy.

I repeat the description of the paper itself which I made to the North Carolina Commission:

The paper itself is a three-columned paper, printed on one side of a sheet of paper. The width of the three columns of type is about eight inches, the length of the type-column (exclusive of heading) is about ten inches. I preferred taking these measurements, as the column-

length would not vary from week to week so much as would the sheet of paper. The sheet was an entire sheet without wire-marks, but did have a water-mark toward the top and lying about half-way between the two side edges of the sheet. This water-mark is of a lozenge shape with crown, fleur-de-lis, and spear or arrow shaft, without letters or figures. The paper was thinner than was usually employed in newspaper work of that day, and had been folded twice, once lengthwise and once across. These folds had weakened the paper so as to call for mending. This repair work consists of two strips of tissue-paper pasted along the folds, and a third one on the right-hand or outer edge of the paper where signs of wear were obvious. The left or inner edge had the appearance of having been taken from a bound volume, and was ragged, with a tendency to be uniformly torn on the upper and lower halves. The type-line was not broken or injured, showing little beyond the effect of a fold. The repair work had been done by Dr. Miller himself. The ink was fair in appearance, the impression not rough enough for an example of medium press (hand) work of that time, not black enough for a good example. The columns were not crowded but were spaced and made-up fair. Altogether it is a paper which is a really fine specimen of the forger's art, and well calculated to pass for a genuine issue of the printing-press of that day. I lay no stress<sup>1</sup> on the spots or discoloration which appear on the sheet, as they belong to the most vulgar processes of the imitator's art; but would add that Dr. Miller is well-informed of the effects produced in ink and paper by certain chemical treatment.

Some of the information obtained by me was as follows:

1. In *Collier's* Miller states that the *Mercury* was "discovered among some papers of Andrew Stevenson, U. S. Minister to the Court of St. James's". He told me that, more than a year before, he had bought about two or three thousand of the papers of Andrew Stevenson, among which were only two or three letters of Stevenson himself. In one of these he found the *Mercury* folded. This particular letter was written by Stevenson in February, 1837, to "B. B. Thatcher, now at Brighton". It had been opened by another Thatcher and returned to Stevenson at London. No mention of a newspaper was given in the letter, and the word which Miller read as "newspaper" was "permission". Inasmuch as it was not until August, 1837, that Stevenson saw the papers in the Public Record Office, this letter could have no connection, direct or indirect, with the alleged *Mercury* of June 3. Miller afterward denied that he had purchased the papers of Andrew Stevenson, but said that he had obtained a collection of two or three thousand autographs, some four or five Stevenson letters being among them. In one of these the *Mercury* was found. As he had indicated the stains on the *Mercury* which had come from the seal of this particular Stevenson letter, he still maintained that the paper had been found with it. But other

<sup>1</sup>I. e., in characterizing the forgery as well executed.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—37.

evidence proved beyond any question that there could have been no possible connection between the two.

2. Miller denied having seen the *Cape-Fear Mercury* of 1769 in the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester. He did try, he said, to obtain a negative, but it came to him broken, and he returned it at once, without taking an impression. By the courtesy of Mr. J. Chester Bushong, of Worcester, who made this negative, I learn that "it was returned to me broken in many pieces, but I had no information from Mr. Miller as to its being received by him in that condition. On the contrary his letter stating and complaining that the plate was not exact size and that he was compelled to have it rephotographed, for which expense he took the liberty to deduct from my bill, would I think very much contradict his statement to you."

Before passing from these two points I may add that to *Collier's* on June 13, 1905, Miller wrote: "I do not yet own the Adams letter and the Cape Fear Mercury, so I could not let you have them if I would. They are many hundred miles away at present, altho I hope to own both soon." In a postscript to this same letter he wrote: "I have just recd. (June 14th, a.m.) the print of 'Cape Fear Mercury'. They had no facilities at all for making an  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 12\frac{1}{4}$  neg. (the orig. size) but were forced to make several smaller negatives and piece them together." Why did Miller, who had found the *Mercury* in Stevenson's papers more than "a year ago" and therefore six months before his letter to *Collier's*, state that he did not own it? and why, if he had it in his possession, did he find it necessary to have it photographed in Worcester, Massachusetts? Mr. Bushong says that Miller ordered the negative about May 15, it was sent to him about June 8, and was returned in pieces about June 21. The original letters of Miller to the photographer have been destroyed, but these dates, given independently of any suggestion from me, correspond with sufficient closeness to that of the letter to *Collier's* to carry conviction.

In this same letter to *Collier's* he began by saying: "I hand you herewith the Proclamation of Gov. Montfort Stokes (original) and a reduced print of the first page of the Cape Fear Mercury for June 3rd, 1775." So that on that date he did have a "reduced" photograph of a *Mercury* (presumably made by the use of the Worcester photograph), and he speaks of a "first page" as though there were other pages to this issue. As stated, the paper shown to me was a single sheet printed only on one side.

3. Miller showed a good knowledge of the chemistry of producing blots, old ink-stains, and paper discolorations—too good a knowl-

edge to be entirely safe, as it must be admitted that his *Mercury* as such is an excellent bit of manufacture.

4. He had obtained from Dr. Graham a copy of the broadside which was printed in facsimile in Johnson's *Traditions and Reminiscences*, the wording of which and its list of signers are those of his *Mercury*. At Baltimore he stated voluntarily that he had "lost" this paper. To *Collier's* in June he described it as in his possession, and to me he showed it framed.

5. He described a package of papers bearing upon the Mecklenburg Declaration which, though boxed, had been stolen from a storage warehouse. Among these papers was the letter from John Adams to Jefferson reproduced in *Collier's*, and there stated to have once been in the possession of Hon. Jefferson M. Levy, who sold it. The letter is, of course, not an Adams autograph (for the original is in the Library of Congress), but a contemporary copy or a later manufacture; and Mr. Levy writes: "I have not seen the Jefferson letter [*i. e.*, Adams to Jefferson] therein referred to and regret very much to say am not the owner of it. Had I been, no one in the world could have bought it."

6. The internal evidence is also against its authenticity. The paper contains the so-called Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence; the list of the killed and wounded at Lexington, Mass., the news being dated Salem, May 25, [1775] (the word "Medford" appears in the third line from the top of the second column); some news items from Philadelphia, dated May 5; an item on the New Jersey Assembly; and a resolution of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, May 15, on the attitude to be taken by the good people of New York toward the British troops. This resolution is headed New York. It is dangerous to undertake to explain the vagaries of a colonial newspaper, but the contents become important, as Dr. Miller seeks to explain any difference that may exist between this *Cape-Fear Mercury* and any other issue of the same paper by claiming this issue of June 3, 1775, to be a "supplement" to the regular issue of the paper. The explanation thus put forward must be rejected. There is nothing except the Mecklenburg Declaration and the list of killed and wounded at Lexington to demand a supplement, and the columns would have been spaced out by advertisements, and not with regular news items. A paragraph from Philadelphia announces the arrival of the "worthy Dr. Benjamin Franklin" and his election to represent Pennsylvania in the Continental Congress. Another states that no official list of the British loss at Lexington had been published. These two items are assigned to Philadelphia, May 5. Franklin did land on the fifth, and he was

chosen to the Continental Congress on the morning of the sixth. The Philadelphia paper (*Pennsylvania Journal*) of May 10 announced the arrival of Franklin, but made no mention then or thereafter, so far as I have discovered, of his election to Congress. The *Virginia Gazette* of May 20 announced his arrival under Philadelphia news, of May 5, but made no mention of his election. The same issue gave the list of provincial loss at Lexington. But the resolve of the Continental Congress of May 15 was not printed in the *Virginia Gazette* until June 3—the very day on which it appeared in the *Cape-Fear Mercury*. It is difficult to explain why this resolve should have travelled so much more rapidly than the more important list of loss at Lexington. The two items may be compared in their travels through the press.

“Loss at Lexington”: started at Worcester May 3; appeared in *Pennsylvania Journal* May 24; in *Cape-Fear Mercury* June 3.

“Congress Resolve”: started from New York May 18; appeared in *New York Gazette* May 22; in *Pennsylvania Journal* May 24; in *Virginia Gazette* June 3; in *Cape-Fear Mercury* June 3.

The official list of British killed, wounded, and missing was printed in the *Pennsylvania Journal* of May 10, yet the *Cape-Fear Mercury* says no such list had been published. It required apparently two full weeks to get the Franklin and Lexington items from Williamsburg, Virginia, to the *Mercury*, and the Congress resolve appeared at Williamsburg and in the *Mercury* on the same day. The *Mercury* cannot be a supplement, and on its face it is not a regular issue.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.



## THE SOUTH, 1820-1830

IN the years between 1820 and 1830 no section underwent more far-reaching changes than did the South Atlantic group of states, made up of Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. Then it was that the South learned the full significance of the westward spread of the cotton-plant.<sup>1</sup>

The invention of the cotton-gin by Eli Whitney<sup>2</sup> in 1793 made possible the profitable cultivation of the short-staple variety of cotton. Before this the labor of taking the seeds by hand from this variety, the only one suited to production in the uplands, had prevented its use; thereafter it was only a question of time when the cotton area, no longer limited to the tide-water region, would extend to the interior, carrying slavery with it. This invention came at an opportune time. Already the inventions of Arkwright, Hargreaves, and Cartwright had worked a revolution in the textile industries of England, by means of the spinning-jenny, the power-loom, and the factory system, furnishing machinery for the manufacture of cotton beyond the world's supply.<sup>3</sup>

Under the stimulus of this demand for cotton, year by year the area of slavery extended toward the west. In the twenties many of the southern counties of Virginia were attempting its cultivation<sup>4</sup>; interior counties of North Carolina were combining cotton culture with their old industries; in South Carolina the area of cotton and slavery had extended up the rivers well beyond the middle of the state<sup>5</sup>; while in Georgia the cotton-planters, so long restrained by the Indian line, broke through the barriers and spread over the newly-ceded lands.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This article is based upon a chapter from the author's forthcoming *Rise of the New West*, American Nation Series.

<sup>2</sup> AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 99.

<sup>3</sup> M. B. Hammond, *The Cotton Industry*, part I. (American Economic Association, 1897), chaps. 1. and 11.; Harry Hammond, "Culture of Cotton," in *The Cotton Plant* (United States Department of Agriculture, 1896); Ernst von Halle, *Baumwollproduktion*, part I., in *Schmoller's Staats- und Socialwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, Band XV., part 1. (1897).

<sup>4</sup> *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention of 1829-1830* (Richmond, 1830), pp. 333, 336; Joseph Martin, *Gazetteer of Virginia and the District of Columbia* (Charlottesville, 1835), 99.

<sup>5</sup> William A. Schaper, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina" (*Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1900*, I.), 387-393.

<sup>6</sup> Ulrich B. Phillips, "Georgia and State Rights" (*Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1901*, II.), 140 (map).

The table exhibiting the progress of the cotton crop printed in the January number of the REVIEW<sup>1</sup> shows the rapidity with which this plant increased.

Tide-water South Carolina and Georgia produced practically all of the cotton crop in 1791, and the total was but two million pounds. By 1821 the South Atlantic states produced one hundred and seventeen million pounds; and five years later, one hundred and eighty millions. But how rapidly in these five years the Southwest gained on the older section is shown by its total of over one hundred and fifty millions. What had occurred was a repeated westward movement: the cotton-plant first spread from the sea-coast to the uplands, and then, by the beginning of our period, advanced to the Gulf Plains, until that region achieved supremacy in its production.

How deeply the section was interested in this crop, and how influential it was in the commerce of the United States, appears from the fact that in 1820 the domestic exports of South Carolina and Georgia had amounted to \$15,215,000, while the value of the domestic exports for all the rest of the United States was \$36,468,000.<sup>2</sup> This, however, inadequately represents the value of the exports from these two cotton states, because a large fraction of the cotton was carried by the coastwise trade to northern ports, and appeared in their shipments. Senator William Smith of South Carolina estimated that in 1818 the real exports of South Carolina and Georgia amounted to "more than half as much as that of the other states of the Union, including the vast and fertile valley of the Mississippi".<sup>3</sup>

Never in history, perhaps, was an economic force more influential upon the life of a people. As the production of cotton increased, the price fell, and the Seaboard South, feeling the competition of the virgin soils of the Southwest, saw in the protective tariff for the development of Northern manufactures the real source of her distress. The price of cotton was in these years a barometer of Southern prosperity and of Southern discontent.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XI. 318; the totals given in this paper are based on the figures of McGregor, instead of on those of the table taken from *De Bow's Review*.

<sup>2</sup> Pitkin, *Statistical View* (edition of 1835), 57.

<sup>3</sup> Speech in the United States Senate, April 11, 1828.

<sup>4</sup> M. B. Hammond, *The Cotton Industry*, part I., appendix 1, gives the average New York prices of middling upland cotton. See also E. J. Donnell, *Chronological and Statistical History of Cotton* (1872), and James L. Watkins, *Production and Price of Cotton for One Hundred Years* (United States Department of Agriculture, 1895).

Even more important than the effect of cotton production upon the prosperity of the South was its effect upon her social system. This economic transformation resuscitated slavery from a moribund condition to a vigorous and aggressive life. Slowly Virginia and North Carolina came to realize that the burden and expense of slavery, as the labor system for their outworn tobacco-fields and corn-fields, was partly counteracted by the demand for their surplus negroes in the cotton-fields of their more southern neighbors. When the Lower South accepted the system as the basis of its prosperity and its society, the tendency in the states of the Upper South to look upon the institution as a heritage to be reluctantly and apologetically accepted grew fainter.<sup>1</sup> The efforts to find some mode of removing the negro from their midst came slowly to an end, and they adjusted themselves to slavery as a permanent system. Meanwhile South Carolina and Georgia found in the institution the source of their economic well-being, and hotly challenged the right of other sections to speak ill of it or meddle with it in any way lest their domestic security be endangered.

When the South became fully conscious that slavery set the section apart from the rest of the nation, when it saw in protection to manufactures and the construction of a system of internal improvements the efforts of other sections to deprive the cotton states of their profits for the promotion of an industrial development in which they did not share, deep discontent prevailed. With but one intermission from the days of Washington to those of Monroe, Virginia planters had ruled the nation. But now, at the same time that power within the section passed from the hands of Virginia to those of South Carolina, the aggressive leader of the Cotton Kingdom, the South found itself a threatened and minority section. When it realized this, it denied the right of the majority to rule, and proceeded to elaborate a system of minority rights as a protection against the forces of national development, believing that these forces threatened the foundations of the prosperity and even the social safety of the South.<sup>2</sup>

From the middle of the eighteenth century the seaboard planters had been learning the lesson of control by a fraction of the population. The South was by no means a unified region in its physiography. The Blue Ridge cut off the low country of Virginia from the Shenandoah Valley, and beyond this valley the Alleghenies sepa-

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford's edition), X, 173, 178; *Niles' Register*, XVII, 363; J. S. Bassett, *Anti-slavery Leaders of North Carolina*, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, XVI.

<sup>2</sup> The most effective statements of this attitude are: John Taylor, *New Views of the Constitution* (Washington, 1823), 261; and Brutus [R. J. Turnbull], *The Crisis* (Charleston, 1827).

rated the rest of the state from those counties which we now know as West Virginia. By the time of the Revolution, in the Carolinas and Georgia a belt of pine barrens, skirting the "fall line" from fifty to one hundred miles from the coast, divided the region of tide-water planters from the small farmers of the up-country. This interior population entered the region in the course of the second half of the eighteenth century. Scotch-Irishmen and Germans passed down the Great Valley from Pennsylvania into Virginia, and through the gaps in the Blue Ridge out to the Piedmont region of the Carolinas, while contemporaneously other streams from Charleston had advanced to meet them. Thus at the close of the eighteenth century the South was divided into two contrasted types of civilization. On the one side were the planters, raising their staple crops of tobacco, rice, and indigo, together with some cultivation of the cereals. To this region belonged the slaves. On the other side was the area of small farmers, raising livestock, wheat, and corn under the same conditions of pioneer farming as characterized the interior of Pennsylvania.

This interior area, made up of the Great Valley and the Piedmont of the South, is a neglected region. It may be named the Old West, for here first developed the conditions characteristic of the West, and the social, economic, and political antagonisms between the coast and the interior. The historians of the separate Southern states appreciate this differentiation in the states of which they write; but the real significance of the region lies in the fact that it was an interstate area, with a striking homogeneity and community of interest, in opposition to the East.

From the period of the so-called War of the Regulation in 1771 down to the third decade of the nineteenth century there was a persistent struggle between the planters of the coast (who controlled the wealth of the region) and the free farmers of the interior. The tide-water counties retained the political power which they already possessed before this tide of settlement flowed into the back-country. Refusing to reapportion the legislature on the basis of numbers, they protected their slaves and their wealth against the dangers of a democracy that was interested in internal improvements and capable of imposing a tax upon slave property in order to promote its own ends.<sup>1</sup> In Virginia in 1825, for example, the

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention, 1829-1830*; *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, XIV. 277, 280, 289; XVI. 267-269; XVII. 324-325; *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1894*, pp. 144 *et seq.*; *ibid.*, 1900, I. 277, 435; *ibid.*, 1901, II. 87-89, 104-106; *Elliel's Debates*, IV. 288, 296-299, 305, 309, 312; *Jefferson, Writings* (Ford's edition), III. 222; *John P. Branch Historical Papers*, II. 100.

western men complained that twenty counties in the upper country, with over two hundred and twenty thousand white inhabitants, had no more weight in the government than twenty counties on tide-water, containing only about fifty thousand; that the six smallest counties in the state, compared with the six largest, enjoyed nearly ten times as much political power.<sup>1</sup> To the gentlemen planters of the seaboard the idea of falling under the control of the interior farmers of the South seemed intolerable. It was only as slavery spread into the interior, with the cultivation of cotton, that the lowlands began to yield, and to permit an increased power in the legislatures to the sections most nearly assimilated to the seaboard type. South Carolina achieved this end in 1808 by the plan of giving to the seaboard the control of one house, while the interior held the other; but it is to be noted that this concession was not made until slavery had pushed so far up the river-courses that the reapportionment preserved the control in the hands of slaveholding counties.<sup>2</sup> A similar course was followed by Virginia in the convention of 1829-1830, when after a long struggle a compromise was adopted by which the balance of power in the state legislature was transferred to the counties of the Piedmont and the Valley.<sup>3</sup> Here slaveholding had progressed so far that the interest of those counties was affiliated rather with the coast than with the trans-Allegheny country. West Virginia remained a discontented area until her independent statehood in the days of the Civil War. These transmontane counties of Virginia were in their political activity during our period rather to be reckoned with the West than with the South.

Thus the southern seaboard had experienced the need of protecting the interests of its slaveholding planters against the free democracy of the interior, and had learned how to safeguard the minority within the section itself. This experience was now to serve the South when, having advanced toward unity by the spread of slavery into the interior, it found itself as a section in the same relation to the Union as a whole which the slaveholding tide-water area had held toward the more populous up-country of the South itself.

The unification of the section is one of the most important features of the period. Not only had the South been divided into opposing areas, as we have seen, but even its population was far from homogeneous. By the time of this decade, however, English,

<sup>1</sup> *Alexandria Herald*, June 10 and 13, 1825.

<sup>2</sup> Calhoun, *Works*, I. 401-406; Schaper, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina," 434-437.

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings and Debates of the Virginia State Convention, 1829-1830*; J. A. C. Chandler, *Representation in Virginia*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, XIV. 286-298.

French Huguenots, Scotch-Irish, and Germans had become assimilated into one people; and the negroes, who by the close of the decade numbered over a million and a half in a white population of less than two millions, were diffusing themselves throughout the section. Contemporaneously the pioneer farming type of the interior was undergoing replacement by the planter type. This was largely a change in economic and social life, rather than a replacement of people.

As cotton-planting and slaveholding advanced into the interior counties of the old southern states, the free farmers were obliged either to change to the plantation economy and purchase slaves, or to sell their lands and migrate. Large numbers of them, particularly in the Carolinas, were Quakers or Baptists, whose religious scruples combined with their agricultural habits to make this change obnoxious. This upland country, too distant from the seashore to permit a satisfactory market, had been a hive from which pioneers had passed into Kentucky and Tennessee, until those states became populous commonwealths. Now the exodus was increased by this later colonization.<sup>1</sup> The Ohio was crossed, the Missouri ascended, and the streams that flowed to the Gulf were followed by movers away from the regions that were undergoing this social and economic reconstruction. This industrial revolution was effective in different degrees in the different states. Comparatively few of Virginia's slaves, which by 1830 numbered nearly half a million (or about forty per cent. of the population), were found in her trans-Allegheny counties, but the Shenandoah Valley was receiving slaves and changing to the plantation type. In North Carolina the slave population of nearly two hundred and fifty thousand (over thirty-five per cent. of the population) at the same date had spread well into the interior, but cotton did not achieve the position there which it held farther south. The interior farmers worked small farms of wheat and corn, laboring side by side with their negro slaves in the fields.<sup>2</sup> South Carolina had over three hundred thousand slaves, more than a majority of her population; and the black belt had extended to the interior. Georgia's slaves, amounting to over two hundred thousand, some-

<sup>1</sup> Turner, "The Colonization of the West", in *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XI. 307-309, 316-317; J. S. Bassett, *Anti-slavery Leaders of North Carolina*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, XVI. 267-271; D. A. Tompkins, *History of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina* (Charlotte, N. C., 1903), I. 99, 117; S. A. [O']Ferrall, *Ramble through the United States* (London, 1832), 167; *History of McLean County, Illinois* (Chicago, 1879), 329; *Personal Recollections of John M. Palmer* (Cincinnati, 1901), 9; Schaper, *loc. cit.*, 393.

<sup>2</sup> J. S. Bassett, *Slavery in the State of North Carolina*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, XVII. 324, 399.

what less than half her population, had steadily advanced from the coast and the Savannah River toward the cotton lands of the interior, pushing before them the less prosperous farmers, who found new homes to the north or south of the cotton belt or migrated to the southwestern frontier.<sup>1</sup> Here, as in North Carolina, the planters in the interior of the state frequently followed the plow or encouraged their slaves by wielding the hoe.<sup>2</sup>

Thus this process of economic transformation passed from the coast toward the mountain barrier, gradually eliminating the inharmonious elements and steadily tending to produce a solidarity of interests. The South as a whole was becoming, for the first time since colonial days, a staple-producing region; and, as diversified farming declined, the region tended to become dependent for its supplies of meat products, horses, and mules, and even of hay and cereals, upon the North and West.

The westward migration of its people checked the growth of the South. It was colonizing the new West at the same time that the Middle Region was rapidly growing in population; and the result was that the proud states of the southern seaboard were reduced to numerical inferiority. Like New England, the South was an almost stationary section. From 1820 to 1830 the states of this group gained little more than half a million souls, hardly more than the increase of the single state of New York. Virginia, with a population of over a million, increased but 13.7 per cent., and the Carolinas only 15.5 per cent. In the next decade (1830-1840) these tendencies were even more clearly shown, for Virginia and the Carolinas then gained but little more than two per cent. Georgia alone showed rapid increase. At the beginning of the decade (1820-1830) the Indians still held all of the territory west of Macon, at the centre of the state, with the exception of two tiers of counties along the southern border; and when these lands were opened to settlement toward the close of the decade, they were occupied by a rush of settlement similar to the occupation of Oklahoma and Indian Territory in our own day. What Maine was to New England, that Georgia was to the southern seaboard, with the difference that it was deeply touched by influences more characteristically western. Because of the traits of her leaders and the rude aggressive policy of her people, Georgia belonged at least as much to the West as to the South. From colonial times the settlers in Georgia had been engaged in an almost

<sup>1</sup> Phillips, *loc. cit.*, 106.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

incessant struggle against the savages on her border, and they had the instincts of a frontier society.<sup>1</sup>

From 1800 to 1830 there were clear evidences of decline throughout the tide-water region. As the movement of capital and population toward the interior continued, wealth was drained from the coast; and as time went on, the competition of the fertile and low-priced lands of the Gulf Basin proved too strong for the outworn lands even of the interior of the South. Under the wasteful system of tobacco and cotton culture, without replenishment of the soil, the staple areas would in any case have declined in value. Even the corn- and wheatlands were exhausted by unscientific farming.<sup>2</sup> Writing in 1814 to Josiah Quincy,<sup>3</sup> John Randolph of Roanoke lamented the decline of the seaboard planters. He declared that the region was now sunk in obscurity; what enterprise or capital there was in the country had retired westward; deer and wild turkeys were not so plentiful anywhere in Kentucky as near the site of the ancient Virginia capital, Williamsburg. In the Virginia convention of 1829 Mr. Mercer estimated that in 1817 land values in Virginia aggregated two hundred and six million dollars, and negroes averaged three hundred dollars; while in 1829 the land values did not surpass ninety millions, and slaves had fallen in value to one hundred and fifty dollars. In a speech in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832 Thomas Marshall<sup>4</sup> asserted that the whole agricultural product of Virginia did not exceed in value the exports of eighty or ninety years before, when it contained not one-sixth of the population. In his judgment, the greater proportion of the larger plantations, with from fifty to one hundred slaves, brought the proprietors into debt; and rarely did a plantation yield one and a half per cent. profit on the capital. So great had become the depression that Randolph prophesied that the time was coming when the masters would run away from the slaves and be advertised by them in the public papers.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Phillips, *loc. cit.*, 88; A. B. Longstreet, *Georgia Scenes* (New York, 1840); G. R. Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia* (New York, 1855); *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, VIII. 443 et seqq.

<sup>2</sup> C. W. Gooch, "Prize Essay on Agriculture in Virginia", in *Lynchburg Virginian*, July 4, 1833; Martin, *Gazetteer of Virginia*, 99-100.

<sup>3</sup> Edmund Quincy, *Life of Josiah Quincy*, 353.

<sup>4</sup> *Proceedings of Virginia Convention, 1829-1830*, 178; Winfield H. Collins, *The Domestic Slave Trade of the Southern States* (New York, 1904), 26.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 24, cited from *Richmond Enquirer*, February 2, 1832; B. W. Arnold, *History of the Tobacco Industry in Virginia from 1860 to 1894*, Johns Hopkins University Studies, XV.

<sup>6</sup> Collins, *loc. cit.*, 26.



It was in this period that Thomas Jefferson fell into such financial embarrassments that he was obliged to request of the legislature of Virginia permission to dispose of property by lottery to pay his debts, and that a subscription was taken up to relieve his distress.<sup>1</sup> At the same time Madison, having vainly tried to get a loan from the United States Bank, was forced to dispose of some of his lands and stocks; and Monroe at the close of his term of office found himself financially ruined. He gave up Oak Hill, and spent his declining years with his son-in-law in New York City.<sup>2</sup> The old-time tide-water mansions, where in an earlier day everybody kept open house, gradually fell into decay.

Sad indeed was the spectacle of Virginia's ancient aristocracy. It had never been a luxurious society. The very wealthy planters, with vast cultivated estates and pretentious homes, were very few. For the most part, the houses were moderate structures, set at intervals of a mile or so apart, often in park-like grounds, with long avenues of trees. The plantation was a little world in itself. Here was made much of the clothing for the slaves, and the mistress of the plantation supervised the spinning and weaving. Leather was tanned on the place; and blacksmithing, wood-working, and other industries were carried on, often under the direction of white mechanics. The planter and his wife commonly had the care of the black families which they owned, looked after them when they were sick, saw to their daily rations, arranged marriages, and determined the daily tasks of the plantation. The abundant hospitality between neighbors gave opportunity for social cultivation, and politics was a favorite subject of conversation.

The leading planters served as justices of the peace, but they were not dependent for their selection upon the popular vote. Appointed by the governor on nomination of the court itself, they constituted a kind of close corporation, exercising local judicial, legislative, and executive functions. The sheriff was appointed by the governor from three justices of the peace recommended by the court, and the court itself appointed the county clerk. Thus the county government of Virginia was distinctly aristocratic. County-court day served as an opportunity for bringing together the freeholders, who included, not only the larger planters, but the small farmers and the poor whites—hangers-on of the greater plantations. Almost no large cities were found in Virginia. The court-house was hardly more than a meeting-place for the rural population. Here farmers

<sup>1</sup> H. S. Randall, *Life of Jefferson*, III. 527, 561.

<sup>2</sup> Gaillard Hunt, *Life of Madison*, 380.

exchanged their goods, traded horses, often fought, and listened to the stump speeches of the orators.<sup>1</sup>

Such were, in the main, the characteristics of that homespun plantation aristocracy which, through the Virginia dynasty, had ruled the nation in the days of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. As their lands declined in value, they naturally sought for an explanation and a remedy.<sup>2</sup> The explanation was found most commonly in the charge that the protective tariff was destroying the prosperity of the South; and in reaction they turned to demand the old days of Jeffersonian rural simplicity under the guardianship of state rights and a strict construction of the Constitution. Madison in vain laid the fall in land values in Virginia to the uncertainty and low prices of the crops and to the attractions of the cheaper and better lands beyond the mountains.<sup>3</sup>

Others emphasized the fact that the semiannual migration toward the west and southwest swept off enterprising portions of the people and much of the capital and movable property of the state, and kept down the price of land by the great quantities which the movers threw into the market. Instead of applying a system of scientific farming and replenishment of the soil, there was a tendency for the planters who remained to get into debt in order to add to their possessions the farms offered for sale by the movers. Thus there was a flow of money toward the west to pay for these new purchases. The overgrown plantations soon began to look tattered and almost desolate. "Galled and gullied hillsides and sedgey, briery fields"<sup>4</sup> showed themselves in every direction. Finally the planter found himself obliged to part with some of his slaves in response to the demand from the new cotton-fields, or to migrate himself, with his caravan of negroes, to open a new home in the Gulf Region. During the period of this survey, the price for prime field-hands in Georgia averaged a little over seven hundred dollars.<sup>5</sup> If the estimate of one hundred and fifty dollars for negroes sold in family lots in Virginia is correct, it is clear that economic law would bring about a condition where Virginia's resources would in part depend upon her supply of slaves to the cotton belt.<sup>6</sup> It is clear also that the Old Dominion had passed the apogee of her political power.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Cary Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney* (Richmond, 1903), 14-24; Susan D. Smedes, *Memorials of a Southern Planter* (Baltimore, 1887), 34-37.

<sup>2</sup> Randall, *Jefferson*, III. 532.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters and Other Writings of Madison*, III. 614.

<sup>4</sup> *Lynchburg Virginian*, July 4, 1833.

<sup>5</sup> Phillips, in *Political Science Quarterly*, XX. 267.

<sup>6</sup> Collins, *Domestic Slave Trade*, 42-46.

It was not only the planters of Virginia that suffered in this period of change. As the more extensive and fertile cotton-fields of the new states of the Southwest opened, North Carolina, and even South Carolina, found themselves embarrassed. With the fall in cotton prices, already mentioned, it became increasingly necessary to possess the advantages of large estates and unexhausted soils, in order to extract a profit from this cultivation. From South Carolina there came a protest more vehement and aggressive than that of the discontented classes of Virginia. Already the indigo plantation had ceased to be profitable, and the rice-planters no longer held their old prosperity.

Charleston was peculiarly suited to lead in a movement of revolt. It was the one important centre of real city life of the seaboard south of Baltimore. Here every February the planters gathered from their plantations, thirty to one hundred and fifty miles away, for a month in their town houses. At this season races, social gaieties, and political conferences vied with each other in engaging their attention. Returning to their plantations in the early spring, they remained until June, when considerations of health compelled them either again to return to the city, to visit the mountains, or to go to such watering-places as Saratoga, in New York. Here again they talked politics and mingled with political leaders of the North. It was not until fall that they were able to return again to their estates.<sup>1</sup> Thus South Carolina, affording a combination of plantation life with the social intercourse of the city, gave peculiar opportunities for exchanging ideas and consolidating the settlement of her leaders.

The condition of South Carolina was doubtless exaggerated by Hayne of South Carolina in his speech in the Senate in 1832, when he characterized it as "not merely one of unexampled depression, but of great and all-pervading distress", with "the mournful evidence of premature decay", "merchants bankrupt or driven away—their capital sunk or transferred to other pursuits—our shipyards broken up—our ships all sold!" "If", said he, "we fly from the city to the country, what do we there behold? Fields abandoned; the hospitable mansions of our fathers deserted; agriculture drooping; our slaves, like their masters, working harder, and faring worse; the planter striving with unavailing efforts to avert the ruin which is before him." He drew a sad picture of the "once thriving planter reduced to despair, . . . gathering up the small remnants of his broken fortune, and, with his wife and his little ones, tearing himself from the scenes of his childhood, and the bones of his ancestors,

<sup>1</sup> A. Hodgson, *Letters from North America* (London, 1824), I. 50.

to seek, in the wilderness, that reward for his industry, of which" the policy of Congress had deprived him.<sup>1</sup>

The genius of the South expressed itself most clearly in the field of politics. If the democratic Middle Region could show a multitude of clever politicians, the aristocratic South possessed an abundance of leaders bold in political initiative and masterful in their ability to use the talents of their Northern allies. When the Missouri question was debated, John Quincy Adams remarked "that if institutions are to be judged by their results in the composition of the councils of this Union, the slave-holders are much more ably represented than the simple freemen".<sup>2</sup>

The Southern statesmen fall into two classes. On the one side was the Virginia group, now for the most part old men, rich in the honors of the nation, still influential through their advice, but no longer directing party policy. Jefferson and Madison were in retirement in their old age; Marshall as chief justice was continuing his career as the expounder of the Constitution in accordance with Federalist ideals. John Randolph, his old eccentricities increased by disease and intemperance, remained to proclaim the extreme doctrines of Southern dissent and to impale his adversaries with javelins of flashing wit. A maker of phrases which stung and festered, he was capable of influencing public opinion somewhat in the same way as are the cartoonists of modern times. But "his course through life had been like that of the arrow which Alcestes shot to heaven, which effected nothing useful, though it left a long stream of light behind it."<sup>3</sup> In North Carolina, the venerable Macon remained to protest like a later Cato against the tendencies of the times, and to raise a warning voice to his fellow-slaveholders against national consolidation.

But in the course of this decade the effective leadership of the South fell to Calhoun of South Carolina and Crawford of Georgia. Calhoun came from that Scotch-Irish Presbyterian stock that occupied the uplands of the South in the middle of the eighteenth century. The family lived on the Indian-fighting frontier of the Carolinas, whence Boone, Robertson, and Andrew Jackson crossed the mountains to Kentucky and Tennessee. Remaining behind, the Calhouns underwent the transformation of their section. At the close of the War of 1812 John C. Calhoun was the rival of Henry Clay in the championship of nationalistic legislation; the antagonist of a "low,

<sup>1</sup> *Register of Debates*, VIII., part 1. 80-81; cf. David F. Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina* (Harvard Historical Studies, vol. 3, 1896), 46-47.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, IV. 506.

<sup>3</sup> *Lynchburg Virginian*, May 9, 1833.

sordid, selfish, and sectional spirit"; the painter of the vision of a great organic nation, every part responsive to the other, sacrificing local interests for the good of the whole.<sup>1</sup> In those days of his fascinating and ardent young manhood<sup>2</sup> he impressed his hearers as an extremist, a man with a tendency to rash speculation and novelty. This philosophical trait of his mind was inherent, not a development of his later sectional attitude. To whatever cause he supported he brought the tendency to draw the last logical deduction; to set boldly forth the complete conclusions. Senator Mills of Massachusetts characterized him about 1823 in these words:<sup>3</sup>

He is ardent, persevering, industrious, and temperate, of great activity and quickness of perception, and rapidity of utterance; as a politician, too theorizing, speculative, and metaphysical,—magnificent in his views of the powers and capacities of the government, and of the virtue, intelligence, and wisdom of the *people*. He is in favor of elevating, cherishing, and increasing all the institutions of the government, and of a vigorous and energetic administration of it. From his rapidity of thought, he is often wrong in his conclusions, and his theories are sometimes wild, extravagant, and impractical. He has always claimed to be, and is, of the Democratic party, but of a very different class from that of Crawford; more like Adams, and his schemes are sometimes denounced by his party as ultra-fanatical.

Another, writing of the same early period of Calhoun's career, declared:

He wants, I think, consistency and perseverance of mind, and seems incapable of long continued and patient investigation. What he does not see at the first examination, he seldom takes pains to search for; but still the lightning glance of his mind, and the rapidity with which he analyzes, never fail to furnish him with all that may be necessary for his immediate purposes. In his legislative career, which, though short, was uncommonly luminous, his love of novelty, and his apparent solicitude to astonish were so great, that he has occasionally been known to go beyond even the dreams of political visionaries, and to propose schemes which were in their nature impracticable or injurious, and which he seemed to offer merely for the purpose of displaying the affluence of his mind, and the fertility of his ingenuity.<sup>4</sup>

William Wirt said in 1824:<sup>5</sup>

Calhoun advised me the other day to study less and trust more to genius; and I believe the advice is sound. He has certainly practised on

<sup>1</sup> Speech on the Bonus Bill, *Annals of Congress*, 14 Cong., 2 Sess., 853-855.

<sup>2</sup> A. Hodgson, *Letters from North America*, I. 80; *Atlantic Monthly*, XXVI. 337-338.

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (1881-1882), XIX. 37.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by A. Hodgson, *Letters from North America*, I. 81. These letters were published as early as 1824.

<sup>5</sup> John P. Kennedy, *Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt* (Philadelphia, 1849), II. 164; cf. Adams, *Memoirs*, V. 361.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—38.

his own precepts and has become, justly, a distinguished man. It may do very well in politics, where a proposition has only to be compared with general principles with which the politician is familiar.

Played upon by the forces of economic change within his section, Calhoun toward the end of the decade reluctantly yielded to the sectional interests of South Carolina, and in 1828 he framed, in the South Carolina Exposition, the first classical statement of the defense of the section against the nation, fashioning the fragments of state-sovereignty doctrine into the nullification argument, and finding in the domestic experience of South Carolina herself the historical basis for his theory of the defense of a minority area against the majority.<sup>1</sup> But even in 1828 he refrained from making public either his authorship of the Exposition or his adherence to nullification.

Crawford also reflected, though in a different way, the processes of sectional change which passed over the South. A Georgian, of Virginia birth, he was an astute, moderate, skilful politician. Unpolished and even coarse in his manners, he had a strong, vigorous mind, and power over men, and a capacity for making combinations and organizing a following. In his earlier career he had incurred the charge of Federalism, upheld the doctrine of implied powers, and denied the right of the state to resist the laws of Congress, except by changing its representation, or by appealing to the sword under the right of revolution. He almost won the nomination for the presidency against Monroe in 1816, and while a member of Monroe's cabinet he incurred the charge of intrigue against the administration, and of building up a personal following by the use of patronage. How much of this charge was due to the envy and jealousy of his rivals (from whom the estimates of his character must principally be drawn) need not here be decided. The important fact is that around the Georgian gathered friends of state sovereignty and the slaveholding interest. Little by little he found himself, with all his love of moderation and his expediency, forced by the tendency of his state to take a sectional position, and in consequence to lose an important part of his following as a national statesman. The Georgians, less speculative than the South-Carolinians, were fully as firm in their determination to secure the legislation essential for the interests of their state and for the cotton area. These forces drove him from his policy of temporizing on the tariff and internal improvements.

The lesser leaders of his state (like Cobb, Forsyth, and Troup) deprived him—as the lesser leaders of South Carolina (Hayne,

<sup>1</sup> Calhoun, *Works* (ed. R. K. Crallé, 1851), I. 402-405.

Hamilton, McDuffie, William Smith, Turnbull, and the rest) deprived Calhoun—of the opportunity to hold a national following, and pushed the two greater statesmen on in a sectional road which their own caution and personal ambitions made them reluctant to tread.

Nor must it be forgotten that early in the decade the South lost two of her ablest political leaders, the wise and moderate Lowndes of South Carolina, and William Pinkney, the brilliant Maryland orator.

Thus in these ten years the influence of economic change within this section transformed the South-Carolinians from warm supporters of a liberal national policy into the straitest of the sect of state-sovereignty advocates, intent upon raising barriers against the flood of nationalism that threatened to overwhelm the South. Virginia, divided by internal dissensions between the interior and the older counties and suffering from the decline of her economic power, saw the sceptre pass to the cotton-raising states, which gave to her doctrines of state sovereignty a new and drastic utterance, and made of them no academic theory, but a plan of action.

No better illustration of the influence of economic interests upon political ideas can be found than in the history of cotton culture and slavery in these important years. The price of cotton fell as production increased. In 1816 the average price of middling uplands in New York was thirty cents, and South Carolina's leaders favored the tariff; in 1820 it was seventeen cents, and the South saw in the protective system a grievance; in 1824 it was fourteen and three-quarters cents, and the South-Carolinians denounced the tariff as unconstitutional; when the woolens bill was agitated in 1827, cotton had fallen to but little more than nine cents, and the radicals of the section threatened civil war. Then it was that Calhoun gave his casting vote against the tariff of 1827, and strove to tide over the storm by the device of nullification. Sectional economic interests had dominated the political philosophy of the greatest Southern statesman since Jefferson, and the South had entered on the long struggle that culminated in the Civil War.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

## MORE LIGHT ON ANDREW JOHNSON<sup>1</sup>

### I.

It was not the fate of Andrew Johnson, during his service as President of the United States, to enjoy an overflowing measure of popularity and good repute. The unfortunate exhibition which he made of himself at his inauguration as Vice-president put him under a sinister cloud whose shadow remained over him for some time after his accession to the Presidency in the spring of 1865; and after February, 1866, the incidents of his conflict with Congress made him the object of more wide-spread hatred and more virulent vituperation than has been the lot, perhaps, of any other man in exalted public station. Between the earlier and the later seasons of obloquy, however, there was a period during which President Johnson occupied a singularly high position in general public esteem. During the summer and the autumn months of 1865 the organs of popular opinion were practically unanimous in praise of the dignity, patriotism, and high purpose which were displayed in the conduct of the administration. Though doubt as to the wisdom of the President's policy in the South was deep and wide-spread, there was no disposition to attribute to him other than statesmanlike motives; and outside of a very small number of vehement radicals, a willingness to let his plan of reconstruction have a fair trial was everywhere manifested.

The good judgment displayed by Mr. Johnson and his advisers was an important factor in the pleasant situation in which the administration found itself. Of equal importance, however, were the peculiar conditions prevailing at the time in the field of party politics. The Republican party had practically lost its identity early in the war, and in 1864 its very name had been formally and officially abandoned. The convention that nominated Lincoln and Johnson had deliberately and ostentatiously assumed the character of a constituent assembly for the organization of a new party, and the name adopted was the Union Party. With the successful termination of the war, however, the single purpose which had given coherence to this new party had been achieved, and the whole situation became chaotic. A revival of ante-bellum Republicanism was

<sup>1</sup> The first part of this article consists of a paper which was read before the Massachusetts Historical Society in November, 1905.



out of the question; for by the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment during the summer and autumn of 1865 the issue which alone had given existence and character to the Republican party was removed from controversy. What, then, was to hold together the voters who had elected Lincoln and Johnson? Nothing, apparently, save the offices and a traditional hostility to the Democratic organization. But hostility to the Democracy was becoming impossible to those who followed the administration. The course of the President during the summer in reference to the South had brought the Democratic leaders, hesitatingly and cautiously but nevertheless certainly, to his support. A concerted movement had begun to rally the ante-bellum Jacksonian Democracy to the standard of the administration. The letter-files of the President offer abundant evidence of the strength and importance of this movement. There may be read words of confidence and eulogy from such sturdy, if now retired, old war-horses as Amos Kendall, Duff Green, and Francis P. Blair, sr. There may be traced the process through which many of the War Democrats resumed their long-vacant places in the councils of the old party and gradually molded it to the support of Andrew Johnson.

The net result of the party situation just sketched was that overt opposition to the administration could not be said to exist. Though the radical faction of the Union party were busily working to organize in Congress resistance to the President's policy, their activity did not manifest itself openly, and the normal adherence to tradition and to the offices kept the state organizations of the party loyal to Mr. Johnson. At the same time the Democratic organizations also refrained from antagonizing him. Accordingly the President had the agreeable experience—probably unprecedented since nominating conventions developed—of receiving in a number of states the hearty indorsement of both parties in connection with the autumn state elections.

It was while the influence of this unique situation was at its maximum that Mr. Johnson was called upon to prepare his first annual message. The reception which this state paper met with was the climax of the brief popularity which it was his fortune to experience. The verdict of contemporaries was, almost without a dissenting voice, that the message was a model of what such a paper should be. The judgments of the leading New York journals are typical. The *Tribune* and *Times*, which under Greeley and Raymond were *a priori* incapable of agreement on any topic, defied logic and agreed on this. The *Times* declared the views of the message to be "full of wisdom", and to be expressed "with great

force and dignity". The *Tribune* doubted "whether any former message has . . . contained so much that will be generally and justly approved, and so little that will or should provoke dissent". The *Evening Post* found it "frank, dignified, direct, and manly", with not a "single ambiguous sentence". To the *Herald* also it appeared "smoothly written", "clear", and "frank". The *Nation*—and here was praise from the very throne itself—declared that any American might read it with pride, and found solid hope for democracy in the fact that such a document should have been produced by "this Tennesseean tailor, who was toiling for his daily bread in the humblest of employments when the chiefs of all other countries were reaping every advantage which school, college, or social position could furnish".

This same tone of admiration was common to observers outside of journalism. Secretary McCulloch considered it "one of the most judicious executive papers which was ever sent to Congress". Charles Francis Adams, minister to Great Britain, thought nothing better had been produced "even when Washington was chief and Hamilton his financier". The Johnson Papers contain great numbers of congratulatory letters, in which the same tone is manifest, though these, designed for Johnson's own eye, need not be quoted as conclusive of their writers' opinions. Only two of these may be referred to as indicating what was expected to be the effect of the message: George Bancroft wrote that everybody approved the message, and that "in less than twenty days the extreme radical opposition will be over"; and Oliver P. Morton assured the President that his policy would be indorsed by the great body of the people, and urged Johnson to use his patronage unsparingly to crush the congressional opposition.

In running through the mass of comment on the message it is clear that the form and style attracted quite as much attention as the substance; and there is everywhere manifest, in qualified critics, a subdued amazement that Andrew Johnson should have produced just the sort of literature that the paper embodied. In the speeches and miscellaneous papers through which his style was known to the public, the smoothness, dignity, and elegance in expression that ran through the message were conspicuously absent, and there was no like dependence for effect on the orderly marshalling of clear but moderately formulated thoughts. Mr. Johnson had not yet, indeed, gained his unpleasant notoriety as a brawler on the platform; but he had a well-established reputation as a hard hitter in debate, who depended for effect on vehemence and iteration rather than on subtlety and penetration.

The striking incongruity between the message and Mr. Johnson's other papers has never caused, so far as I know, any well-grounded denial of authorship to the President. In the Washington correspondence of the *New York Nation* of December 14, 1865, it is said:

Some there are who have an intimate persuasion that the entire message is the composition of Secretary Seward. But those who are nearest to the matter aver that the Secretary of State is only responsible for the portion relating to foreign affairs, with an occasional re-touching elsewhere of the expression, while President Johnson can claim full credit for the rest.

Mr. Blaine, when reviewing the period, was evidently impressed by the un-Johnsonese character of the message, and was thus easily led to support the view mentioned by the *Nation's* correspondent. "The moderation in language [I quote Blaine's words] and the general conservatism which distinguished the message were perhaps justly attributed to Mr. Seward." Mr. Rhodes, in his fifth volume, indicates that his trained critical faculty gave him very serious doubts in respect to this matter, but that the doubts were almost overcome. "If Andrew Johnson wrote it [he says]—and the weight of authority seems to imply that he did—it shows that he ought always to have addressed his countrymen in carefully prepared letters and messages."

In April, 1905, I spent a few days in looking over the Johnson Papers, now in the Library of Congress. I had no particular object in view, but was on a general foraging expedition through the material, ready for anything that might turn up. Least of all had I in mind the matter of the authorship of Johnson's first message. While going through the files of letters received, my curiosity was momentarily aroused by a note marked "private and confidential" (one always is unduly attracted by that label), and signed by a man of wide reputation, whose name had never, however, been prominently associated, so far as I knew, with the career of President Johnson. The note was so worded as to conceal entirely the matter concerning which it was written, but indicated a relation of a very intimate nature between the writer and the President. I made a memorandum of the letter, with a query as to what it was about, and dismissed it from my mind.

Several days later I was looking through the series of large envelopes containing the preparatory notes and various drafts of each of Johnson's messages. In most cases the envelope devoted to a particular message contains a considerable number of more or less full drafts, in various handwritings, of the treatment to be

given to special topics, while the final draft of the message is in the clear, formal hand of a copying-clerk. The annual message of 1865; however, differs from all the rest. The envelope devoted to it contains nothing of consequence save a complete draft of the message in a uniform hand which is not that of either Johnson or any other person in the executive service at that time. As I was turning over the pages of this manuscript and wondering with mild curiosity why the first message should have come down in a shape so different from the rest, I was joined by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts. It is well known to students of American history that Mr. Ford is endowed with a sort of sixth sense by which he can identify at sight the chirography of any man who has figured in that history since 1492. Ford, glancing over the pages before me, observed in his quiet, casual way: "That looks like the handwriting of " so and so. I at once was impressed with the force of the suggestion, since I had seen something of the writing of the person named. But what in a moment struck me as of particular significance was the fact that the name mentioned by Ford was the same name that was signed to the "private and confidential" letter mentioned above. Why this coincidence especially roused my interest will be apparent when the precise tenor of the letter is stated. It runs thus:

My task will be done to-morrow, but as no one knows what I am about and as I am my own secretary, I must ask a day or two more for a careful revision and for making a clean copy, which must be done with my own hand.

Recalling this passage in the letter and my curiosity as to what this task might have been, I hastily looked up my notes to see what the date of the letter was. It proved to be November 9, 1865. This was, of course, the precise time at which the message must have been nearing completion, for it had to be sent to Congress on December 5. The handwriting of the letter was, when compared, beyond all question the same as that of the manuscript draft. There is thus no room to doubt that the task referred to in the letter was the writing of Andrew Johnson's first annual message, and that the manuscript in the Library of Congress is the "clean copy" which the author made about the middle of November with his "own hand". A collation of the manuscript with the text of the message as sent in was made by Mr. Ford last September, revealing that practically the only differences, apart from the insertion of the routine paragraphs summarizing the work of the various executive departments, were such modifications of phraseology as would be likely to be made by the writer himself in proof.

That Mr. Johnson himself did not write the final draft of his message is thus conclusively established. To what degree the actual writer was dependent upon the directions of the President—whether he was a draftsman with full discretion or merely a literary reviser of Johnson's own draft—does not appear from the evidence at hand. The age, learning, political experience, and literary reputation of the actual writer render it *a priori* improbable that he would have needed or submitted to very rigorous restriction by a man of Johnson's antecedents. The East Tennessee mountaineer, whose boast that he feared no one was doubtless the truth, must nevertheless, under the responsibility with which his crude but honest nature was now burdened, have looked up with sincere respect and deference to a man eight years his senior, whose early life had been passed amid the best cultural influences of his native Massachusetts, whose middle life had found him in the high places of power and dignity of the same party which Johnson was serving in lower places, and whose declining years were being devoted to the glorification, by the ways of literature, research, and learning, of that people and that Constitution which were the theme of all the President's declamation and the object of all his fealty. It is *a priori* improbable, I say, that Andrew Johnson exercised very close supervision over the construction of this message; for the man who actually wrote it was no less well qualified a person than George Bancroft.

That Johnson's most praised state paper was the product, not of his own, but of a more competent writer's pen, is from the standpoint of serious history an interesting rather than an important fact. Neither Constitution, law, nor custom has ever required that a President of the United States should personally frame his messages to Congress or other official documents; and it would be a safe conjecture that a relatively small proportion of such papers in our history have embodied the unaided labor of the men by whom they are signed. It is unusual, however, for a President to intrust the preparation of important papers to persons wholly outside the circle of his official advisers. Mr. Johnson's cabinet included at least two members, Stanton and Seward, whose qualifications for preparing the message were beyond question. If Stanton be considered as not available because of the indications he had already given of lack of sympathy with the President's policy, still Seward remains—a man whose opinions, whose experience, and whose ability made him apparently the one person to whom resort should be made for the task in hand. It is not surprising that the wide-spread contemporary sentiment which Blaine reflected should have attributed

a dominant influence in the message to Seward. Now that we know otherwise, now that we have found that a mind of totally different antecedents and training gave the final impress to the paper, we may possibly get some useful side-lights on the history of the time by speculating on the motives which actuated the President in having recourse to an outsider. Thus the discovery of the authorship may become important as well as interesting.

It should be understood, in the first place, that the intimate relations of Bancroft and Johnson are demonstrated by other evidence than that already adduced, and that the authorship of the message throws an entertaining light on some of their later correspondence. The letter already referred to, for example, in which Bancroft tells Johnson that everybody approves the message, rings with a different tone when we know with what personal interest and satisfaction Bancroft recorded this fact. Another letter, written just before Congress met, reveals Bancroft as a diligent laborer in the cause of the President's policy, though in this particular case the effectiveness of his efforts was impaired by the fact that they were exerted upon that particularly tough subject, Charles Sumner. Under date of December 1 Bancroft tells Johnson that he has just had a two or three hours' talk with Sumner, and tried to calm him on the suffrage question (fancy anybody calming Sumner on the suffrage question!); that Sumner was bent on making some speeches in the Senate, but intended to cultivate friendly relations with Johnson and would call on him; that Sumner agreed with Johnson on foreign relations, and that therefore the President might do well to conciliate the Senator by "a little freedom of conversation on foreign affairs". We know, from Pierce's memoir of Sumner, the sequel of this amiable attempt to make oil and water mix. The Senator called on the President; found him, like so many an other who failed to be convinced of the righteousness of Sumner's views, hopelessly dull and wrongheaded; and left the White House to turn upon its occupant the turbid stream of Demosthenian and Ciceronian invective which had hitherto been directed at only the slaveholder and the rebel.

A little later Bancroft was greatly perturbed, as well as honored, by an invitation to deliver the oration on Lincoln which was to be the central feature of a memorial service of the two houses. In a hasty note of January 8 he asks Johnson concisely, "What shall I do?" Why he should have thought it necessary to get the President's direction does not appear. We know from Gideon Welles, however, that politics and the tension between radicals and conservatives were operative in connection with this memorial service,

and that Stanton, who had first been selected as orator of the day, had been dropped as too radical and too little in sympathy with the dead President's reconstruction policy. Possibly Bancroft feared some scheme to compromise him with Johnson, and hence took the precaution of consulting the President. At all events, the answer must have been favorable to acceptance, for Bancroft did deliver the address.

These incidents all confirm the personal intimacy between Bancroft and Johnson; they do not, however, explain why Johnson should have intrusted the historian with a task of such fundamental political significance as the construction of the message. While we must, for such explanation, enter the field of conjecture rather than of history, I am disposed to believe that the clue is to be found in a consideration of Bancroft's political past and of Johnson's projects for a political future.

George Bancroft's politics forms one of the most striking features of his long and versatile career. His early apostasy from the Federalism which dominated his family, his college, and his whole social and literary *milieu* is almost what Professor Hart would call an "essential" of Massachusetts history. He was the bright particular star of the unspeakable Jacksonian Democracy in his native state, was collector of the port of Boston under Van Buren, was Secretary of the Navy and minister to Great Britain under Polk, and remained steadfast in the Democratic faith till the wartime. Then, in the stress of arms, he became conspicuous among those so-called War Democrats whose fusion with the heterogeneous and ill-compacted Republican party so transformed it that its identity was quite lost. In behalf of the Union Bancroft wrote, spoke, and schemed with all the nervous and not always well-directed energy that was characteristic of him. Every prominent enterprise for the promotion of the Union cause in New York, where he resided throughout the war, shows in the record the name of Bancroft; and his industry extended to undertakings in many other parts of the country.

This record of rock-ribbed Democracy and Unionism could not but have been very impressive to Andrew Johnson, whose own record was closely parallel to it. By the autumn of 1865 the President, as abundant evidence shows, had become definitively committed to the general policy of giving to the Union party, now that the distinctive object of its organization had been attained, a character that should perpetuate the ideals and traditions of the ante-bellum and anti-secession Democracy. From the radicalism that was seeking to revolutionize the social and political system he turned by the instinct of his nature; from the Whiggery which might offer



a refuge to conservatism he turned by the habit of a lifelong hostility. The principles and the men of the old Democratic party must, in his mind, now dominate the political situation. What were the principles of the old Democracy as they had been iterated and reiterated in Johnson's speeches? Government for and by the masses of the people; the sanctity and far-reaching autonomy of the states; the beneficence and perpetuity of the Union; the supreme and divinely inspired excellence of the Constitution; and the manifest destiny of the United States to lead all mankind in political wisdom and in the ways of righteousness and enlightenment. But even as we read this noble and exalted if somewhat chauvinistic list, does it not seem to every one who knows even superficially the writings of George Bancroft that we are cataloguing the principles and ideals which he systematically ascribed to his native land? No Prussian scholar of the Bismarckian era was ever more certain that the goal of all history, when scientifically interpreted, was the unification of Germany under the Hohenzollerns, than Bancroft was that the climax of humanity's political achievement was the American republic and its Constitution. And so we find in the message that "the hand of divine Providence was never more plainly visible in the affairs of men than in the framing and the adopting of" the Constitution; that this was, "of all events in modern times, the most pregnant with consequences for every people of the earth"; that the supreme merit of this American system is the guaranties it embodies of permanence to the general government, indestructibility to the states, and immunity to the citizens in all their natural rights. We have, in short, the principles for which the old Democratic party stood in its best estate before the war.

To formulate these principles and to rally the people to them was, I believe, the purpose which Johnson had chiefly in mind when he confronted the preparation of his first message. With such a purpose presumed, the resort to Bancroft as draftsman is an obvious and self-explained deduction. For the business in hand there was needed no old-time Whig, saturated with the heresies of a defunct and discredited party; no antislavery agitator, who had professed his faith in some law higher than the Constitution; no adept of the radicalism which maintained that the inspired work of 1787 had proved inadequate to the exigencies of rebellion and had been superseded: none of these, but one who had, through all the storm and stress of ante-bellum and per-bellum politics, remained undeviatingly true to the creed of the Democracy—to the view of



the Constitution which Jefferson and Madison had maintained, and to the view of the Union which had been taken by Jackson.

The melancholy failure of the enterprise which was so hopefully inaugurated by Bancroft's literary labor, it is no function of this article to describe. We may pause merely to recall the fact that the labor of the historian, though so notably unsuccessful in its political results, met with an entirely adequate personal reward in his appointment as minister to Berlin in 1867. In this position he was retained by President Grant until 1874. To one who is aware of the feeling toward Johnson that prevailed in the Senate in 1867 and in Grant in 1869, it will always be a matter of curious speculation whether Bancroft would have been confirmed by the one authority or retained in office by the other if it had been known that he was the author of Andrew Johnson's first annual message.

## II.

When during the Christmas holidays of 1905 I found myself again inspecting the Johnson Papers at Washington, the facts and inferences which are set forth above made it impossible for me to refrain from a more or less careful examination of President Johnson's other messages, with reference to the question of authorship. In Secretary Hugh McCulloch's *Men and Measures of Half a Century* it is stated, incidentally to high praise of Mr. Johnson's messages, that they were, with the exception of the vetoes, "written by himself, with no other help than what he received from his private secretary" (p. 406). This statement, which Mr. McCulloch doubtless believed to be the exact truth, seems at least questionable in respect to the first annual message. As to the other annual messages also, the evidence of the papers is that the one man who had least to do with drafting them was Andrew Johnson. In respect to the vetoes, McCulloch says that the one on the Tenure of Office Bill was written by Stanton—though it was brought out in the impeachment trial that Seward wrote it—and that the "other vetoes were mainly prepared by Attorney-General Henry Stanbery". The idea that Stanbery was responsible for those vetoes especially which involved fundamental doctrines of constitutional law has been adopted by various writers on the period. If it were true, it would militate against the view which I suggested above, that Mr. Johnson's natural recourse was to men of Democratic rather than Whigish traditions; for Stanbery had been a Whig.

McCulloch's statement may be dismissed as that of one who had never known whereof he spoke, and who had, when he wrote his book, a most untrustworthy memory for what he had known. Of

six consecutive sentences in the passage from which I have quoted, four contain errors of fact. The Johnson Papers reveal that the President took great precaution to conceal from his cabinet the identity of the outsiders who assisted him. His Secretary of the Treasury, therefore, probably never had any first-hand knowledge as to the authorship of the messages, but merely recorded his recollection of the rumors of the time.

In taking up the authorship of the vetoes in the light of the manuscripts, we find that Mr. Johnson, at the beginning of his difference with Congress, employed the aid of various supporters in official life, though not in the cabinet. Thus for the first of his veto messages, that disapproving the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, drafts were submitted by Senator Cowan and General J. S. Fullerton. But clear evidence of outside authorship—outside, that is, of officials of the government, whether executive or legislative—appears first in connection with the military Reconstruction Act which became law March 2, 1867. This was the measure by which Congress took the whole future of the South into its own hands, declaring illegal the governments which the President held to be the constitutional organs of the states, setting up military rule pure and simple, and enfranchising the freedmen. The bill involved the most revolutionary treatment of the fundamental law, and was looked upon with panic by conservative men throughout the land. During the discussion of this measure in Congress certain of the extreme radicals were busying themselves also with the scheme of impeaching the President. From all sides thus, under the influence of the great radical victory in the autumn elections of 1866, the enemies of Johnson and his policy were assuming the offensive. He was now thrown back for support almost wholly on the old Democracy; and out of that ancient organization a redoubtable champion quietly betook himself to the President's side and entered upon an intimate relationship, the details of which the Johnson Papers now for the first time enable us quite fully to know.

Jeremiah S. Black, Attorney-general and Secretary of State in the Buchanan administration, had not won the most unqualified admiration for his part in the last months of that unhappy President's term; but his career as an advocate and jurist had given him laurels which were denied in his political life. In either line he had made himself a reputation, which time was unceasingly to enhance, as a master of dialectic and of invective. To President Johnson, destitute though he was of all fear for the outcome of the conflict in which he was becoming so desperately involved, it must have been peculiarly pleasant to receive the letter from Black dated January 22,

1867, which we find in the Papers. The writer assures Johnson that the public mind of the nation has not yet grasped the principles at issue between the President and Congress, and urges that the matter be presented in a solemn appeal to the people. Black then offers his assistance in preparing such a document, but only on condition that his connection with it be an absolute secret from even the cabinet.

The "solemn appeal" suggested was never made in that form. Possibly Johnson felt that the principles which a year's incessant iteration in his messages and speeches had not enabled the public mind to grasp would not be brought within the comprehension of that unsympathetic entity by a "solemn appeal", even in Judge Black's most effective style. But the Reconstruction Bill which was pending in Congress was evidently destined to pass sooner or later; and then, in what had come to be the natural course of events, it would have to be vetoed. The preparation of the veto would afford an admirable field for Black's constitutional learning and literary gifts; and the document would, since the majority in Congress were quite past the stage at which any attention was paid by them to vetoes, serve almost its sole purpose as an appeal to the people. Such, at any rate, must have been in a general way the President's thought, for the veto message, which was sent in on March 2, was in fact written by Black.

The secret of this authorship was not, however, so successfully maintained as had been the case with the Bancroft message. At this time, in connection with a resolution for impeachment which had been introduced, the House judiciary committee was engaged in what proved to be the most disgraceful and indecent inquisition in the history of legislative procedure. The purpose was to find some ground on which to base the impeachment of the President; and the method was to bring before the committee, and subject to the utmost pressure of its authority, every human being who, through public position or private relationship, through the hostility of partizan rancor or the delation of bar-room slander, afforded any promise of revealing anything to the discredit of Johnson in either his public or his private life. In some unknown way this committee got wind of Black's relation with the President, and they used the knowledge to torment the writer and if possible discredit the signer of the message. A letter of Black to the President tells the story in words which, if forcible, are well justified:

Those low devils of the judiciary committee summoned me up and, notwithstanding my protest, compelled me to testify concerning the last veto. I mentioned to Mr. Stanbery what I felt obliged to reveal. I

told him too beforehand what I would have to say, and he agreed with me that there was no escape. You are well aware that not a word was ever uttered by you to me that the purest patriot would be ashamed of. So far as I know you seemed to me always anxious for the liberty and laws of your country. I told them that conversations of this character had drawn me on to put the substance of them into written form and you had used some of them in that message.

The testimony of Judge Black was published the following November in the report of the judiciary committee. It is entertaining reading, and shows that the witness made the best of his situation. The inquisitors insisted on an exact indication of the paragraphs which stood as Black had written them, but he maintained that so many changes had been made as to render such indication impossible. A comparison of his manuscript, which is preserved in the Johnson Papers, with the message as sent in shows that three-fourths of his draft was used without any change whatever. Loyalty to the President led the writer to minimize his own part in preparing the message; but as between Jeremiah S. Black, the soul of truth, and the crazy<sup>1</sup> partizan zealots who were guiding the procedure of the committee, the recording angel could never have hesitated a moment in awarding responsibility for this lapse from perfect candor.

The revelation of Judge Black's annoyance at having been found out is not all the interesting information derivable from his letter to the President. The opening sentences have not yet been quoted. They run as follows: "I have drawn up a paper which I submit. It is transcribed by a perfectly confidential person—a member of my own family." The accompanying paper here referred to is a draft of a veto message of the Supplementary Reconstruction Act of March 23, 1867. This means that probably on the very day, March 14, when the judiciary committee gave Judge Black an unhappy half-hour for his connection with one of Johnson's reconstruction vetoes, the unterrified and indefatigable victim devoted many other half-hours to the formulation of his ideas for another of those vetoes.

Whether the draft of Judge Black was the one actually used by the President was a question which the transcription by another hand made it difficult to answer; for the envelope devoted to the veto of March 23 contains two drafts. The letter which revealed that Black was the author of one of them was, when I discovered

<sup>1</sup> This term in its literal sense is justified in regard to at least one of the foremost "impeachers"; see the speech and testimony of Congressman Ashley, cited in David M. DeWitt, *The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson* (New York, 1903), pp. 210, 292 *et seqq.*

it, folded within the draft which, on comparison, proved to be that actually signed and sent to Congress. But a careful consideration of the contents and style of the two, with various other circumstances, roused my suspicion that possibly the letter had got transferred to the wrong manuscript. This proved ultimately to be the case; for I happened by the merest chance to discover, in one corner of the first page of the rejected draft, a small stenographic sign which a familiarity with the system used by the President's secretary enabled me to identify as the symbol for "Black". The draft which, after considerable revision, was actually sent in was apparently written by Attorney-general Stanbery, or under his direction.

After this veto of the act of March 23, the Johnson Papers present but little evidence of relations between Black and the President until October 23, 1867. Of that date appears a letter to Johnson in which Black says that he is obliged to go to Pittsburgh, and continues: "In the mean time I am doing all that I ought and you will not be disappointed in any expectations you have formed. I will do all that I said and do it in good time." He concludes with a reference to the *Alta Vela* claim, concerning which we shall hear more later. The passages quoted have a familiar and stimulating air to one who has traversed the Johnson Papers thus far. The date suggests that the time is near when an annual message has to be prepared. One is not surprised, therefore, to find a bulky manuscript in Black's familiar hand, and to discover by collation that the manuscript corresponds with great exactness to the first half and more of the message which was sent to Congress on December 3. Black's part in the preparation of this third annual message was, indeed, precisely the same as Bancroft's in the first annual message: each writer formulated all that part of the document which was not sent in by the various departments, and each embodied in his draft the constitutional, legal, and philosophical doctrine of that Jacksonian Democracy of which he, with the President, had been a part.

But in this case again Judge Black was unsuccessful in escaping the responsibility for his work. The *Philadelphia Daily Chronicle*, owned by John W. Forney, secretary of the Senate, published on December 5 a letter from a Washington correspondent in which, after reference to Black's connection with the first reconstruction veto, the writer said of the annual message: "With some knowledge of the style of that eminent dialectician I have had little difficulty in tracing alike his venom and his logic in the argument which Andrew Johnson has adopted as his own." The correspondent who

wrote this was in all probability Forney himself. He was one of the most vehement of the radicals; and enjoyed the distinction, which indeed he has not yet lost, of being the only man ever described as a "dead duck" by a President of the United States in a public address. Forney's antipathy to Johnson had not been mitigated by the not altogether elegant and judicious term which the latter had applied to him; he had been a political and journalistic associate of Black in ante-bellum days, and in that way had acquired the knowledge which enabled him to make so shrewd a guess as to the authorship of the message. I think it extremely probable that it was Forney who made the suggestion on which the judiciary committee had acted in summoning Black to testify as to the veto.

The parallel which has been suggested as to the political antecedents of the two outsiders whom Johnson had employed to prepare his first and third annual messages respectively cannot be extended to the general tone of the two documents. In the latter paper there is nothing of the mild philosophy and conciliatory spirit which pervades Bancroft's production. The Constitution is indeed held up as a venerated embodiment of supreme political wisdom, but only by way of emphasizing the indignities which have been heaped upon it by Congress through the laws concerning reconstruction. Judge Black indulged to the full his faculty for genial and dignified excoriation. Congress was lectured for its sins, was urged to reform, and was reminded that the latest elections had indicated that the people were awake to the delinquencies of their representatives. The defiant and aggressive tone of the message was not what the most judicious of the President's friends regarded as wise; but it was that which was most characteristic of both Johnson and Black in the circumstances that then existed. Both possessed in an extraordinary degree the *gaudium certaminis*, and in the conflict with the radicals the latter had for a year pressed the President till his back was full to the wall and he could not yield another inch. His control of subordinates had been taken from him by the Tenure of Office Act, his pardoning power had been assailed, his authority as commander-in-chief of the army had been limited, and a resolution to impeach him was pending in the House, awaiting some favorable conjuncture at which a majority could be secured to take up the process of ejecting him from his office.

That Andrew Johnson, under such circumstances, sent to Congress the message which Jeremiah Black prepared for him is a convincing testimony to his fearlessness and audacity, whatever it may signify as to his discretion. There is abundant evidence, however, that every step that he took was carefully considered, and that

he had the benefit of counsel from minds fully as shrewd and astute as those of his adversaries. Many letters, short and pithy, appear in the Johnson Papers at this time from the aged Thomas Ewing, whose judgment shows no abatement of the soundness which had given him high repute among the Whigs of a generation before. It must be said, however, that the President, deferential as he was to the octogenarian's views, showed less disposition to follow the advice of the "conservative Whigs", on whom Ewing urged him to rely, than to take up with the dubious counselors of Democratic faith, against whom Ewing solemnly gave him warning.

One particular bit of evidence which the Johnson Papers reveal as to the position assumed by the President in reference to the proposed impeachment is worthy of a little consideration at this point. To understand the matter properly it is necessary to bear in mind that the most extreme promoters of the movement for impeachment, with Benjamin F. Butler at their head, had propounded and gravely urged the principle that upon the adoption of a resolution of impeachment by the House of Representatives the President would be *ipso facto* suspended from the exercise of his functions till his guilt or innocence should be formally determined by the issue of his trial before the Senate. In other words, this extraordinary doctrine was that the House might by a simple majority vote depose the President, at least temporarily, from his office. It is incredible that there should ever have been a possibility that such a doctrine might be adopted by Congress. But very serious assaults had been made upon the constitutional prerogatives of the executive, and Mr. Johnson had resolved that if this final indignity should be attempted, it must be resisted to the bitter end and regardless of consequences. Accordingly, in a cabinet meeting of November 30, 1867, the President's advisers were confronted with a formal demand for their "separate" opinions, "in writing", on questions propounded in a paper which he read to them.

This very interesting document begins with a sufficiently startling declaration: "You are no doubt aware that certain evil-disposed persons have formed a conspiracy to depose the President of the United States and to supply his place by an individual of their own selection." Their plan is then explained as that of passing in the House a resolution of impeachment, and then, under color of law, by resolution of both houses, declining to recognize him as President pending his trial. After dwelling upon the evidence that such a scheme is on foot, the paper declares that Mr. Johnson has never for a moment contemplated the possibility of yielding to any demand that he give up his office, and that the likeli-



hood of a conflict between the President and Congress makes it indispensable that "the Executive and the Heads of the several Departments should, upon a question so momentous, understand one another without any reserve whatever". Then follow the questions on which the opinions are requested:

1. Can the President be removed from office in any other mode than that prescribed in the Constitution, *viz*: "On impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors"?

2. Pending impeachment and before conviction and judgment, can the President, by act of Congress or otherwise, be suspended from office, and the President *pro tempore* of the Senate or other officer provided by law, be authorized to act as President during such suspension?

3. If a law providing for such suspension and such exercise of the office by any officer other than the President should be passed, would it be the duty of the President to surrender his office or withdraw from the exercise of his official duties, or to continue to exercise them and to maintain his authority?

4. Whether such deposition or arrest of the President and the transfer of his official functions to another person, would be less a violation of the organic law if attempted or done by members of Congress, or at their instigation, than if attempted or effected by private parties?

That Mr. Johnson was in deadly earnest in his intention to have the formally expressed support of his constitutional advisers, in any struggle that he might be obliged to engage in to maintain his office, seems to be indicated by the fact that a copy of the above-described paper had been prepared and addressed to each member of the cabinet. The copies are all carefully preserved along with that which he read and signed. Why they were not delivered is explained in a note signed by the President and appended to his own copy. It runs as follows:

The above prepared paper was submitted to the Cabinet this day, and, after a full and free discussion, was unanimously approved, thus dispensing with the necessity of requesting written answers.

This official statement as to why the project so elaborately prepared was not carried out falls far short of satisfying the curious investigator. Was so formal a procedure necessary in order to satisfy Mr. Johnson that those advisers whose fidelity had already been proved by such severe tests would stand by him on an issue which many of his radical adversaries hesitated to raise because of its constitutional weakness? Can it be imagined that the discussion in the cabinet over this paper made more certain than before the opinion of Seward or McCulloch or Welles or Stanbery or Randall or Browning? The suggestion is preposterous. There is, however,



one member of the cabinet whose name has not been mentioned. At this date the War Department was presided over by General Grant as secretary *ad interim* in place of Stanton, who had been suspended from office in August. Grant was easily the most popular man in the United States, and was in control of the army. The struggle for his favor and support had been a leading feature of the conflict between Johnson and the radicals, and the wiles of the politicians had sadly perplexed the General, whose political acumen was subnormal. It seems to me, therefore, not unlikely that one leading motive in Johnson's project to poll the cabinet was to secure a formal committal of General Grant to the policy of resistance in case an attempt should be made by the radicals to depose the President. The discussion in the cabinet meeting, with the argument all on one side, doubtless soon drew forth an explicit concurrence of the General in the common opinion. Having secured this desideratum, Mr. Johnson probably allowed himself to be convinced that the danger with which he felt himself threatened was not so imminent as he feared, and that the formal written advice was not important. In yielding, however, he did not fail to indorse the outcome on the paper which he had read, and to preserve all the documents against future contingencies and for the edification and mystification of latter-day students of history.

In the light thrown by this record of the cabinet meeting of November 30, 1867, a much-discussed passage in the annual message of December 3 takes on a somewhat different aspect from that in which it has hitherto appeared. Of all the defiance and aggressiveness which, as I have said, that document embodied, none excited more resentment in Congress or more distress among the President's conservative friends than the paragraph in which occurs this passage:

If Congress should pass an act which is not only in palpable conflict with the Constitution, but will certainly, if carried out, produce immediate and irreparable injury to the organic structure of the Government, and if there be neither judicial remedy for the wrongs it inflicts nor power in the people to protect themselves without the official aid of their elected defender—if, for instance, the legislative department should pass an act even through all the forms of law to abolish a coordinate department of the Government—in such a case the President must take the high responsibilities of his office and save the life of the nation at all hazards.

This was the text of much rancorous declamation by the radical leaders in Congress as a gratuitous assault on the law-making branch of the government. The august Sumner went so far, in manifesting his indignation, as to vote against the customary motion to print

the message. Among the President's friends were many who felt that the paragraph was uncalled for, and needlessly gave color to a charge which had been unceasingly agitated by the radicals, that Johnson was seeking an opportunity to oppose the execution of the Reconstruction Acts. The message declares, in the sentence immediately following what is quoted above, that these acts were not believed to be in the class described as justifying resistance. Moderate men thought, therefore, that if nothing was to be done, nothing should have been needlessly said. In view of what took place in the cabinet, it is clear that the obnoxious paragraph was formulated not with any reference to the Reconstruction Acts, but solely with reference to the possible procedure in impeachment. This explanation is put beyond all question by another fact, not as yet referred to, in connection with the paper submitted by the President to the cabinet. Among the documents preserved in relation to that affair is the original manuscript draft of the paper, and this is in the handwriting of Jeremiah S. Black. That is to say, the cabinet paper and the annual message were the product of the same mind.

It would be most satisfactory to the student who has followed through the manuscripts the record of this intimate relation of the Pennsylvania jurist with President Johnson if the relation might be shown to have terminated as agreeably as happened in the case of the other outside coadjutor, Bancroft. If the framer of one annual message found retreat and distinction in a foreign ministry, the man who guided the President not only in an annual message, but also in a veto and—most intimate of all—in polling and testing the cabinet itself, might reasonably be expected to have received exceptional marks of favor. But this was not to be. It is a matter of fully recorded and widely discussed history that Black's intimate relations with the President ceased abruptly and dramatically at precisely the acutest crisis of Johnson's career—a crisis, moreover, which there is little room to doubt Black's influence contributed much to precipitate.

In February, 1868, the President removed Secretary Stanton from office and was thereupon promptly impeached. It is revealed by the Johnson Papers that the policy of making the removal was the subject of strong representations to the President by outside advisers both pro and con. The moderate men, represented particularly by the aged Ewing, urgently opposed the idea, on the ground that the removal would surely strengthen the radicals and bring on the impeachment, with all the turmoil and peril to both the President and the country that would follow. It was at this time that Ewing wrote (January 29) the letter referred to above, warn-

ing Johnson against the influence of Democratic advisers. This allusion was undoubtedly directed against Black, whose close relations with Johnson were well known in inner political circles. But Andrew Johnson's predilection for the part that involved a fight prevailed, and the result predicted by Ewing followed. With impeachment a fact and the preparations for the trial in progress, the interest and anxiety of the old Whig statesman made him outspoken, and on March 1 he wrote imploring Johnson not to engage Black among the counsel for his defense:

His very presence there . . . will injure your cause. He is known as a violent man—has talents but no discretion, and he would in the heat of his nature sacrifice your cause rather than omit saying a bitter thing. . . . Stanbery and Judge Curtis are safe and sufficient counsellors. They may want help to hunt up precedents, and for that let *them* choose their man.

In spite of this entreaty, Black was soon announced among the President's counsel, Johnson having overruled the representations of Black himself, supported by Curtis and Stanbery, that his participation was undesirable.<sup>1</sup> But on March 19 he sent to Johnson a letter of which the first sentence was as follows: "Your determination to determine nothing for the relief of the owners of *Alta Vela* makes it impossible for me to serve you longer as counsel in the impeachment case." The withdrawal thus announced furnished food for much gossip and scandal at the time, and the circumstances connected with it were diligently employed, with the customary suppressions and distortions, by both sides in the trial of the President. Through all the controversy, however, the letters of Black to Johnson were never, so far as I know, published in full. In the light of these, as they exist in the Johnson Papers, there was in the episode nothing whatever discreditable morally to any party concerned, though there is considerable that tends to confirm the opinion of Mr. Ewing, quoted above, as to Judge Black's temper and discretion. Reduced to its lowest terms, the situation which forced Black to retire was this: For a long time he, as counsel for a firm dealing in guano, had sought to secure action by the President in putting them in possession of *Alta Vela*, a small guano island off the coast of San Domingo. The State Department had determined, after investigation, that the desired action would not be justified by the facts. Judge Black had been urging the President to overrule the State Department's action, and had abused Seward unmercifully, even

<sup>1</sup> Black, in his letter of withdrawal, gives this version of the incident of his becoming associated with the counsel for the defense.

charging that the Secretary was in corrupt collusion with certain parties who were profiting by the exclusion of Black's clients. The President thus was called upon to decide between Black and Seward, between his unofficial and his official adviser. At precisely the worst possible moment, from the point of view of a favorable impression on the President, Black's associates in the case sent to Johnson an indorsement of their demand signed by the chief radicals of the House, headed by Benjamin F. Butler and including Thaddeus Stevens. Thereupon the President promptly announced that, as against this company and Black, he would sustain Seward. Black as promptly withdrew from the impeachment case, on the ground, as he explained in a letter to Johnson, that his duty to his *Alta Vela* clients would require him, for the protection of their interests, to engage in proceedings "which would make it impossible for me to aid you in any way or manner". That is, his clients would have to go to Congress for relief, and this would oblige them to antagonize the administration at every point necessary in order to promote their cause.

With this incident Judge Black disappears from the Johnson Papers. His participation in the trial of the President would unquestionably have added an element of picturesqueness—if possible an element of bitterness—to the proceedings. Whether the addition would have been of material benefit to the defendant, it is possible for the unbiassed historical student, with the venerable Whig statesman, most seriously to doubt.

WILLIAM A. DUNNING.

## DOCUMENTS

### *Papers of Dr. James McHenry on the Federal Convention of 1787*

For the following papers the readers of the REVIEW are indebted to Professor Bernard C. Steiner of the Johns Hopkins University, who is preparing for publication a volume containing the biography of Dr. James McHenry of Maryland and selections from his correspondence. Dr. McHenry was, it is familiar, one of the Maryland delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Among his papers is found a leather-bound octavo volume containing a journal kept by him while in attendance upon the Convention. At the conclusion of this journal are presented some lesser documents from his papers, relating to the same events. From a passage in one of these, no. VIII. *infra*, it appears that his notes were written down in the book from day to day during the progress of the Convention. It may be worth mentioning that the first page of the book bears a memorandum of a charge against the state of Maryland for seventy-two days' attendance at the Convention, at thirty-five shillings a day—£126.

McHenry's notes of the debates have a considerable value for certain parts of the history of the Convention, little for others. His notes for May 29, 30, and 31 are exceptionally full; for instance, they give a fuller account than is elsewhere preserved of Randolph's opening speech, though that is one of the few speeches of which the author gave Madison a text. At this point the diarist was called away by his brother's illness, and he did not return till August 4. By this time that weariness of keeping a diary which besets both boys and men had fallen upon nearly all those whose notes have been preserved. "The foremost horseman rode alone". Practically it is only the unwearying Madison who helps us from here on. McHenry came back fresh to his diarizing on August 4, and from that date to August 9 his notes add materially to Madison's incomparable record. After that time he takes notes with little zest or fullness, except in a few cases where Maryland or the Maryland delegates were especially concerned. In instances where the vote of the state was divided, he sometimes enables us to see the record of individual Maryland delegates.

Much the most interesting trait of his journal, however, is its contribution to our knowledge of the private consultations of the members from Maryland. Glimpses of such conferences, of the sort which would now be called caucussing, we have had before in the case of some states, but nowhere so detailed a revelation of what went on in the *coulisses* of the great conclave, beginning August 6, when the Maryland delegation was for the first time made complete.

## I.

PHILADELPHIA 14 May 1787.

## Convention.

On the 25th seven states being represented viz. New-York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, George Washington was elected (unanimously) president of the convention.

The convention appoint a committee to prepare and report rules for conducting business which were reported, debated, and in general agreed to on the 28th.

## 29.

Governor Randolph opened the business of the convention.<sup>1</sup> He observed that the confederation fulfilled *none* of the objects for which it was framed. 1st. It does not provide against foreign invasions. 2dly. It does not secure harmony to the States. 3d. It is incapable of producing certain blessings to the States. 4. It cannot defend itself against encroachments. 5th. It is not superior to State constitutions.

1st. *It does not provide against foreign invasion.* If a State acts against a foreign power contrary to the laws of nations or violates a treaty, it cannot punish that State, or compel its obedience to the treaty. It can only leave the offending State to the operations of the offended power. It therefore cannot prevent a war. If the rights of an ambassador be invaded by any citizen it is only in a few States that any laws exist to punish the offender. A State may encroach on foreign possessions in its neighbourhood and Congress cannot prevent it. Disputes that respect naturalization cannot be adjusted. None of the judges in the several States under the obligation of an oath to support the confederation, in which view this writing will be made to yield to State constitutions.

Imbecility of the Confederation equally conspicuous when called upon to support a war. The journals of Congress a history of expedients. The States in arrears to the federal treasury from the  
to the

<sup>1</sup> McHenry's report of this opening speech of Randolph adds much to that which Randolph gave to Madison and which is printed in Gilpin, pp. 728-730, and elsewhere.

What reason to expect that the treasury will be better filled in future, or that money can be obtained under the present powers of Congress to support a war. *Volunteers* not to be depended on for such a purpose. *Militia* difficult to be collected and almost impossible to be kept in the field. *Draughts* stretch the strings of government too violently to be adopted. Nothing short of a regular military force will answer the end of war, and this only to be created and supported by money.

2. *It does not secure harmony to the States.* It cannot preserve the particular States against seditions within themselves or combinations against each other. What laws in the confederation authorise Congress to intrude troops into a State. What authority to determine which of the citizens of a State is in the right, The supporters or the opposers of the government, Those who wish to change it, or they who wish to preserve it.

No provision to prevent the States breaking out into war. One State may as it were underbid another by duties, and thus keep up a State of war.

3. *Incapable to produce certain blessings.* The benefits of which we are *singly incapable* cannot be produced by the union. The 5 per cent impost not agreed; a blessing congress ought to be enabled to obtain.

Congress ought to posses[s] a power to prevent emissions of bills of credit.

Under this head may be considered the establishment of great national works—the improvement of inland navigation—agriculture—manufactures—a freer intercourse among the citizens.

4. *It cannot defend itself against incroachments.* Not an animated existence which has not the powers of defence. Not a political existence which ought not to possess it. In every Congress there has been a party opposed to federal measures. In every State assembly there has been a party opposed to federal measures. The States have been therefore delinquent. To What expedient can congress resort, to compel delinquent States to do what is right. If force, this force must be drawn from the States, and the States may or may not furnish it.

5. *Inferior to State constitutions.* State constitutions formed at an early period of the war, and by persons *elected by the people* for that purpose. These in general with one or two exceptions established about 1786 [sic]. The *confederation* was formed long after this, and had its ratification not by any *special appointment* from the people, but from the several assemblies. No judge will say that the *confederation* is paramount to a State consti[tu]tion.

Thus we see that the confederation is incompetent to any *one* object for which it was instituted. The framers of it wise and great men; but human rights were the chief knowle[d]ge of the times when it was framed so far as they applied to oppose Great Britain. Requisitions for men and money had never offered their form to our assemblies. None of

those vices that have since discovered themselves were apprehended. Its defects therefore no reflexion [*sic*] on its contrivers.

Having pointed out its defects, let us not be affraid to view with a steady eye the perils with which we are surrounded. Look at the public countenance from New Hampshire to Georgia. Are we not on the eve of war, which is only prevented by the hopes from this convention.

Our chief danger arises from the democratic parts of our constitutions. It is a maxim which I hold incontrovertible, that the powers of government exercised by the people swallows [*sic*] up the other branches. None of the constitutions have provided sufficient checks against the democracy. The feeble Senate of Virginia is a phantom. Maryland has a more powerful senate, but the late distractions in that State, have discovered that it is not powerful enough. The check established in the constitution of New York and Massachusets is yet a stronger barrier against democracy, but they all seem insufficient.

He then submitted the following propositions which he read and commented upon seriatim.<sup>1</sup> . . .

The convention resolved that on to-morrow, the convention resolve itself into a committee of the whole, to take into consideration the state of the american union.<sup>2</sup>

It was observed by Mr. Hamilton before adjourning that it struck him as a necessary and preliminary inquiry to the propositions from Virginia whether the united States were susceptible of one government, or required a separte existence connected only by leagues offensive and defensive and treaties of commerce.<sup>3</sup>

### May 30.

Mr. Randolph wished the house to dissent from the first proposition on the paper delivered in to the convention in order to take up the following

- 1st. That a union of the States merely federal will not accomplish the object proposed by the articles of confederation, namely "common defence, security of liberty, and general welfare."
2. That no treaty or treaties between the whole or a less number of the States in their sovereign capacities will accomplish their common defence, liberty, or welfare.<sup>4</sup>
3. That therefore a national government ought to be established consisting of a supreme legislature, judi[c]iary and executive.

<sup>1</sup> The text of the Virginia plan here presented is that which is designated as A in Jameson's "Studies in the History of the Federal Convention of 1787", *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1902, I. 103-111. It is not necessary to reprint it.

<sup>2</sup> The diarist ignores Charles Pinckney's plan.

<sup>3</sup> These remarks of Hamilton have not been reported hitherto.

<sup>4</sup> This resolution does not, like the other two, appear in the journal of the committee, but appears, with slightly different phrasology in both cases, in Madison's notes, *Documentary History*, III. 21, and in Yates, *Secret Proceedings*, ed. 1821, p. 98.



On a question taken on the last proposition after various attempts to amend it, the same was agreed to. For it, Massachusetts, Pennsylv., Delaware, Virginia, N. Carolina and S. Carolina—against it Connecticut. New York divided.

[The proceedings of May 30, up to this point, are set forth in much more detail in a loose folio sheet, in Dr. McHenry's handwriting, which was found lying in the book containing the main body of his notes. It seems best to insert this paper at this point. It reads as follows:

*May 30th.*

1st resolution from Mr. Randol[ph].

Mr. R. wishes to have that resol. dissented to. The resol. postponed to take up the following:

1st. That a union of the States merely federal will not accomplish the object proposed by the articles of confederation, namely, "common defence, security of liberty, and general welfare".

Mr. C. Pinkney wishes to know whether the establishment of this Resolution is intended as a ground for a consolidation of the several States into one.

Mr. Randol[ph] has nothing further in contemplation than what the propositions he has submitted yesterday has [*sic*] expressed.

2. Resolved that no treaty or treaties between the whole or a less number of the States in their sovereign capacities will accomplish their common defence, liberty or welfare.

3. Resolved therefore that a national government[*t*] ought to be established consisting of a supreme legislature, judiciary and executive.

Mr. Whythe [*sic*] presumes from the silence of the house that they gentn. are prepared to pass on the resolution and proposes its being put.

Mr. Butler—does not think the house prepared, that he is not. Wishes Mr. Randolph to shew that the existence of the States cannot be preserved by any other mode than a national government.

Gen. Pinkney—Thinks agreeing to the resolve is declaring that the convention does not act under the authority of the recommendation of Congress.

The first resolution postponed to take up the 3d. viz—Resolved that a national government ought to be established consisting of a supreme legislature, judiciary and executive.

1787, 21 Febry. Resolution of Congress.<sup>1</sup>

Resolved that in the opinion of Congress it is expedient that on the 2d Monday of May next a convention of delegates who shall have been

<sup>1</sup>This speech does not appear elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup>McHenry probably copies this at this point in his notes for reference in connection with the preceding remarks as to the powers of the Convention.

appointed by the several States to be held at Philada. for the sole and expres[s] purpose of *revising the articles of confederation*, and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall when agreed [sic] to in Congress, and confirmed by the States, render the *federal constitution*, adequate to the exigencies of government and the preservation of the union."

Mr. Randolph<sup>1</sup> explains the intention of the 3d Resolution. Repeats the substance of his yesterdays observations. It is only meant to give the national government a power to defend and protect itself. To take therefore from the respective legislatures or States, no more sover[e]ignty than is competent to this end.

Mr. Dickinson. Under obligations to the gentlemen who brought forward the systems laid before the house yesterday. Yet differs from the mode of proceeding to which the resolutions or propositions before the Committee lead. Would propose a more simple mode. All agree that the confederation is defective all agree that it ought to be amended. We are a nation altho' consisting of parts or States—we are also confederated, and he hopes we shall always remain confederated. The enquiry should be—

1. What are the legislative powers which we should vest in Congress.
2. What judiciary powers.
3. What executive powers.

We may resolve therefore, in order to let us into the business. That the confederation is defective; and then proceed to the definition of such powers as may be thought adequate to the objects for which it was instituted.

Mr. E. Gerry. Does not rise to speak to the *merits* of the question before the Committee but to the *mode*.

A distinction has been made between a *federal* and *national* government. We ought not to determine that there is this distinction for if we do, it is questionable not only whether this convention can propose an government totally different or whether Congress itself would have a right to pass such a resolution as that before the house. The commission from Massachusetts empowers the deputies to proceed agreeably to the recommendation of Congress. This the foundation of the convention. If we have a right to pass this resolution we have a right to annihilate the confederation.

Proposes—In the opinion of this convention, provision should be made for the establishment of a *federal* legislative, judiciary, and executive.

Gouverneur Morris. Not yet ripe for a decision, because men seem to have affixed different explanations to the terms before the house. 1. We are not now under a *federal* gover[n]ment. 2. There is no such thing. A *federal* government is that which has a right to compel every

<sup>1</sup> These remarks of Randolph, and those of Dickinson which follow, seem not to be found in Madison's or any of the other notes hitherto printed.

part to do its duty. The federal gov. has no such compelling capacities, whether considered in their legislative, judicial or Executive qualities.

The States in their appointments Congress in their recommendations point directly to the establishment of a *supreme* government capable of "the common defence, security of liberty and general welfare.

Cannot conceive of a government in which there can exist two *supremes*. A federal agreement which each party may violate at pleasure cannot answer the purpose. One government better calculated to prevent wars or render them less expensive or bloody than many.

We had better take a supreme government now, than a despot twenty years hence—for come he must.

Mr. Reed, Genl. [Pinckney] 2dng. proposes—In order to carry into execution the design of the States in this meeting<sup>1</sup> and to accomplish the *objects* proposed by the confederation resolved that A more effective government consisting of a legislative judiciary and executive ought to be established.

In order to carry into execution

Mr. R. King<sup>2</sup>—The object of the motion from Virginia, an establishment of a government that is to act upon the whole people of the U. S.

The object of the motion from Delaware seems to have application merely to the strengthening the confederation by some additional powers.

Mr. Maddison—The motion does go to bring out the sense of the house—whether the States shall be governed by one power. If agreed to it will decide nothing. The meaning of the States that the confed. is defect. and ought to be amended. In agreeing to the<sup>3</sup>. . . ]

The Committee then proceeded to consider the 2 Resolution in Mr. Randolphs paper viz

That the rights of suffrage in the national legislature ought to be proportioned to the quotas of contribution or to the number of free inhabitants as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases.

As this gave the large States the most absolute controul over the lesser ones it met with opposition which produced an adjournment without any determination.

The Committee of the whole to sit to-morrow.

31 May.

Mr. Randolph motioned to take into consideration, vz. That the national legislature ought to consist of two branches.

agreed to.

Part of the 4 resolution moved, vz. That the members of the first branch ought to be elected by the people of the several States.

6 States aff. 2 neg. 2 divided.

<sup>1</sup> "in forming this Convention" (*Journal*).

<sup>2</sup> King's remarks, and those of Madison which follow, seem not to appear in other records of the debates.

<sup>3</sup> End of paper. Unfinished.

5 Reso. so far as follows taken up vz. That the members of the second branch of the national legislature ought to be elected by those of the first out of a proper number of persons nominated by the individual legislatures.

Neg. 7. affirm 3. aff. Mass. S. C. Virginia.<sup>1</sup>

Motioned vz.

That each branch ought to possess the right of originating acts.  
agreed.

That the national legislature ought to be empowered to enjoy the *legislative rights vested in Congress by the confedn. and moreover to legislate in all cases to which the separate States are incompetent.*

agreed.

or in which the harmony of the U. S. may be interrupted by the exercise of individual legislation.

agreed.

To negative all laws passed by the several States contravening in the opinion of the national legislature the articles of union, (or any treaty subsisting under the authority of the union, added by Dr. Franklin).

agreed.

And to call forth the force of the union against any member of the union failing to fulfil its duty under the articles thereof.

postponed.

Mr. E. Gery thought this clause "ought to be expressed so as the people might not understand it to prevent their being alarmed".

This idea rejected on account of its *artifice*, and because the system without such a declaration gave the government the means to secure itself.

June 1st.

Recd an express from home that my brother lay dangerously sick in consequence of which I set out immediately for Baltimore.

Left Baltimore 2 August.

August 4th.

Returned to Philada. The committee of Convention ready to report. Their report in the hands of Dunlop the printer to strike off copies for the members.<sup>4</sup>

Augt. 6.

Convention met. present 8 States. Report delivered in by Mr. Rutledge. read. Convention adjourned till to-morrow to give the members an opportunity to consider the report.

<sup>1</sup> More correct than the journal. See Madison, *Documentary History*, III. 32.

<sup>2</sup> See Jameson, *ubi sup.*, 107.

<sup>3</sup> The next two paragraphs seem not to occur in any other report.

<sup>4</sup> See Bancroft, *Constitution*, II. 119, 139; Ford, *Pamphlets on the Constitution*, 390.

Proposed to Mr. D. Carrol, Mr. Jenifer, Mr. Mercer and Mr. Martin,<sup>1</sup> to meet to confer on the report, and to p[r]epare ourselves to act in unison.

Met at Mr. Carrolls lodgings in the afternoon. I repeated the object of our meeting, and proposed that we should take the report up by paragraphs and give our opinions thereon. Mr. Mercer wished to know of me whether I thought Maryland would embrace such a system. I told him I did not know, but I presumed the people would not object to a wise system. He extended this idea to the other gentlemen. Mr. Martin said they would not; That he was against the system, that a compromise only had enabled its abettors to bring it into its present stage—that had Mr. Jenifer voted with him, things would have taken a different turn. Mr. Jenifer said he voted with him till he saw it was in vain to oppose its progress. I begged the gentlemen to observe some order to enable us to do the business we had convened upon. I wished that we could be unanimous—and would make a proposition to effect it. I would join the deputation in bringing on a motion to postpone the report, to try the affections of the house to an amendment of the confederation without altering the sovereignty of suffrage; which failing we should then agree to render the system reported as perfect as we could, in the mean while to consider our motion to fail and proceed to confer upon the report agreeably to the intention of our meeting. I. E. That we should now and at our future meetings alter the report to our own judgement to be able to appear unanimous in case our motion failed.

Mr. Carrol could not agree to this proposition, because he did not think the confederation could be amended to answer its intentions. I thought that it was susceptible of a revision which would sufficiently invigorate it for the exigencies of the times. Mr. Mercer thought otherwise as did Mr. Jenifer. This proposition to conciliate the deputation was rejected.

Mr. Martin in the course of the conversation observed that he was against two branches—that we [sic] was against the people electing the representatives of the national government. That he wished to see the States governments rendered capable of the most vigorous exertions, and so knit together by a confederation as to act together on national emergencies.

Finding that we could come to no conclusions I recommended meeting again to-morrow, for unless we could appear in the convention with some degree of unanimity it would be unnecessary to remain in it, sacrificing time and money without being able to render any service. They agreed to meet to-morrow, except Mr. Martin who said he was going to New York and would not be back till monday following.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The other members from Maryland. Mercer did not take his seat till this day.

<sup>2</sup> Martin in the *Maryland Journal* says that he was absent five days. Ford, *Essays on the Constitution*, 341. Ellsworth ("Landholder") says ten. *Ibid.*, :86. Martin replied, *ibid.*, 346, that he set out for New York on August 7, and AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—40.

It being of importance to know and to fix the opinions of my colleagues on the most consequential articles of the new system, I prepared the following propositions, for that purpose viz.<sup>1</sup>

Art. IV. Sec. 5. Will you use your best endeavours to obtain for the senate an equal authority over money bills with the house of representatives.?

Art. VII. Sect. 6. Will you use your best endeavours to have it made a part of the system that "no navigation act shall be passed without the assent of two thirds of the representation from each State?

In case these alterations cannot be obtained will you give your assent to the 5 sect. of the IV article and 6 sect. of the VII. article as they stand in the report?

Will you also, (in case these alterations are not obtained) agree that the ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for organizing the new constitutions?

N. B. Saw Mr. Mercer make out a list of the members names who had attended or were attending in convention with for and against marked opposite most of them—asked carelessly what question occasioned his being so particular upon which he told me laughing that it was no question but that those marked with a for were for a king. I then asked him how he knew that to which he said no matter the thing is so. I took a copy with his permission, and Mr. Martin seeing me about it asked What it was. I told him, in the words Mr. Mercer had told me, when he begged me to let him copy the list which I did.<sup>2</sup>

#### Augt. 7.

+ Mr. Martin set out for New York on this day so we were without his concurrence in the propositions.

Shewed these propositions to Mr. Carroll Mr. Jenifer and Mr. Mercer in convention. They said in general terms that they believed they should accord with them. I observed to Mr. Carroll<sup>[1]</sup> that we would meet again in the evening and talk over the subject.<sup>3</sup>

The business of the Convention proceeded.

The preamble or caption and the 1. and 2. article passed without debate, the 3 article was amended so as to leave it with the legislature to appoint after the first meeting, the day for the succeeding meetings.

The IV article gave rise to a long debate, respecting the *qualifications of the electors*.

Mr. Dickinson contended for confining the rights of election in the

returned and took his seat in the Convention on Monday, August 13. But see *post*, August 16.

<sup>1</sup> On the next page are two insertions, marked "N. B." and "+"; and places are indicated for their insertion.

<sup>2</sup> See *post*, nos. III.-IX., and especially no. VIII.

<sup>3</sup> Crossed out: "that I had my doubt whether the gentlemen had given themselves time to consider the effect of the propositions or the part we ought to take respecting them."

first branch to *free holders*. No one could be considered as having an interest in the government unless he possessed some of the soil.

The fear of an aristocracy was a theoretical fiction. The owners of the soil could have no interest distinct from the country. There was no reason to dread a few men becoming lords of such an extent of territory as to enable them to govern at their pleasure.

Gouverneur Morris—thought that wise men should not suffer themselves to be misguided by sound. If the suffrage was to be open to all *freemen*—the government would indubitably be an aristocracy. The system was a system of Aristocracy. It put it in the power of opulent men whose business created numerous dependents to rule at all elections. Hence so soon as we erected large manufactories and our towns became more populous—wealthy merchants and manufacturers would elect the house of representatives. This was an aristocracy. This could only be avoided by confining the suffrage to *free holders*. Mr. Maddison supported similar sentiments.

The old ideas of taxation and representation were opposed to such reasoning.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Franklin spoke on this occasion. He observed that in time of war a country owed much to the lower class of citizens. Our late war was an instance of what they could suffer and perform. If denied the right of suffrage it would debase their spirit and detach them from the interest of the country. One thousand of our seamen were confined in English prisons—had bribes offered them to go on board English vessels which they rejected. An English ship was taken by one of our men of war. It was proposed to the English sailors to join ours in a cruise and share alike with th[e]m in the captures. They immediately agreed to the proposal. This difference of behavior arises from<sup>2</sup> the operation of freedom in America, and the laws in England. One British Statute excluded a number of subjects from a suffrage. These immediately became slaves. At th[r]ee o'clock the house adjourned without coming to any issue.

At five o'clock in the evening I went to Mr. Carrolls lodging to confer with my colleagues on the points I had submitted to their consideration. I found Mr. Carroll alone when We entered upon their merits. He agreed with me that the deputation should oppose a resolute face to the 5 sect of the IV article,<sup>3</sup> and that they ought to reject it. He appeared fully sensible of its tendency—That lodging in the house of representatives the sole right of raising and appropriating money, upon which the Senate had only a negative, gave to that branch an inordinate power in the constitution, which must end in its destruction. That without equal powers they were not an equal check upon each other—and that this was

<sup>1</sup> This is apparently McHenry's comment. What follows, from "Doctor Franklin" to "became slaves" is written on the opposite page of the manuscript, and marked to be inserted.

<sup>2</sup> Crossed out: "this discription of men having a right of suffrage."

<sup>3</sup> To the effect that money-bills should originate in the House of Representatives alone, and that the Senate should have no right to alter or amend them.

the chance that appeared for obtained [*sic*. obtaining?] an equal suffrage, or a suffrage equal to wh[a]t we had in the present confedn.

We accorded also that the deputation should in no event consent to the 6 sect. of VII article.<sup>1</sup> He saw plainly that as a quorum consisted of a majority of the members of each house—that the dearest interest[s?] of trade were under the controul of four States or of 17 membe[r]s in one branch and 8 in the other branch.<sup>2</sup>

We adverted also to the 1st sect of the VII article which enabled the legislature to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, and to regulate commerce among the several States. We almost shuddered at the fate of the commerce of Maryland should we be unable to make any change in this extraordinary power.

We agreed that our deputation ought never to assent to this article in its present form or without obtaining such a provision as I proposed.

I now begged his particular attention to my last proposition.<sup>3</sup> By the XXII article we were called upon to agree that the system should be submitted to a convention chosen in each State under the recommendation of its legislature. And that a less number of conventions than the whole agreeing to the system should be sufficient to organise the constitution.

We had taken an oath to support our constitution and frame of government. We had been empowered by a legislature legally constituted to revise the confederation and fit it for the *exigencies of government*, and *preservation of the union*. Could we do this business in a manner contrary to our constitution? I feared [(Note by McHenry.) This was said first I *thought*—then I *feared*'] we could not. If we relinquished any of the rights or powers of our government to the U. S. of America, we could no otherwise agree to that relinquishment than in the mode our constitution prescribed for making changes or alterations in it.

Mr. Carroll[I] said he had felt his doubts respecting the propriety of this article as it respected Maryland; but he hoped we should be able to get over this difficulty.

Mr. Jenifer now came in to whom Mr. Carroll repeated what we had said upon my propositions and our determinations. Mr. Jenifer agreed to act in unison with us but seemed to have vague ideas of the mischiefs of the system as it stood in the report.

I wished to impress him with the necessity to support us, and touched upon some popular points.

I suggested to him the unfavorable impression it would make upon the people on account of its expence. An army and navy was [*sic*] to be raised and supported, expensive courts of judicature to be maintained, and a princely president to be provided for etc. That it was plain

<sup>1</sup> "No navigation act shall be passed without the assent of two thirds of the members present in each house."

<sup>2</sup> Marginal note: "33, 17 and 14, 8."

<sup>3</sup> As to ratification by nine states. See p. 604, *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> The word "feared" is substituted for a word erased.



that the revenue for these purposes was to be chiefly drawn from commerce. That Maryland in this case would have this resource taken from her, without the expences of her own government being lessened. That what would be raised from her commerce and by indirect taxation would far exceed the proportion she would be called upon to pay under the present confederation.

An increase of taxes, and a decrease in the objects of taxation as they respected a revenue for the State would not prove very palatable to our people, who might think that the whole objects of taxation were hardly sufficient to discharge the States obligations.

Mr. Mercer came in, and said he would go with the deputation on the points in question. He would wish it to be understood however, that he did not like the system, that it was weak—That he would produce a better one since the convention had undertaken to go radically to work, that perhaps he would not be supported by any one, but if he was not, he would go with the stream.

*August 8.*

The 2 sect. of the IV. article was amended to read 7 insted of three years. It was proposed to add to the section "at least one year preceding his election". negatived. Maryland divided. M[ess]rs. Mercer and Carrol neg. Mr. Jenifer and myself aff.

The fifth section giving the sole power of raising and appropriating money to the house of representatives expunged.

*August 9.*

6 and 7 sects. agreed to without amendment.

The 1 section of the V article underwent an emendatory alteration. The last clause—"each member shall have one vote"—opposed by Mr. Mason, Randolph and a few others on account of the Senate by the loss of the 5 sect of the IV article having the same powers over money bills as the house of representatives.—The whole however was agreed to.

Sect. 2. agreed to after an emendatory addition.

Sect. 3 agreed to after inserting inhabitant for resident, as being less equivocal, and 9 years for 4 years.<sup>1</sup>

Gouverneur Morris proposed insted of 4 years 14. He would have confined the members he said to natives—but for its appearance and the effects it might have against the system.

Mr. Mason had the same wishes, but he could not think of excluding those foreigners who had taken a part and borne with the country the dangers and burdenth[s] [*sic*] of the war.

Mr. Maddison was against such an invidious distinction. The matter might be safely intrusted to the respective legislatures. Doctor Franklin was of the same opinion. Mr. Willson expressed himself feelingly

<sup>1</sup> The next three paragraphs marked for insertion. Written on preceding page.

on the same side. It might happen, he said, that he who had been thought worthy of being trusted with the framing of the Constitution, might be excluded from it. He had not been born in this country. He considered such excluding as one of the most galling chains which the human mind could experience. It was wrong to deprive the government of the talents virtue and abilities of such foreigners as might chuse to remove to this country. The corrup[t] of other countries would not come here. Those who were tired in opposing such corruptions would be drawn hither, etc. etc.

Sect. 4 agreed to.

#### Article VI.

Sect. 1. Agreed to with this amendment insted of "*but their provisions concerning them.*"

adjourned

*August 10.*

Sect. 2. dissented to. Sects. 3. 4 5 and 6 agreed to.<sup>1</sup>

*Augt. 11.*

Sect. 7 agreed to after expunging the words "when it shall be acting in a legislative capacity" and inserting after the words "publish them" except such parts as in their judgement require secrecy.

After much debate<sup>2</sup> agreed to reconsider on monday the 5 sect. of the 4 article.

*August 13.*

The 2 sect. of the 4 article and the 3 sect. of the 5 article was reconsidered and lengthily debated. The 7 years however in the first and the 9 years in the latter remained and the articles stood as before reconsideration.

*Augt. 14.*

Sect. 8 agreed to, premising the words "during the session of the legislature".<sup>4</sup>

Sect. 9. postponed.

Sect. 10. altered, that the members of both branches be paid out of the treasury of the United States, their pay to be ascertained by law.

*August 15.*

Sect. 11. agreed to.

Sect. 12 postponed.

Sect. 13. Agreed to with the alteration of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of each house instead of *two thirds*.

<sup>1</sup> The reference is to the substitution, for the words indicated, of the words "regulations in each of the foregoing cases", etc.

<sup>2</sup> After amendment of sections 3 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> Not much is reported by Madison, the only other reporter for this day.

<sup>4</sup> This was done on August 11, according to the journal and Madison.

16 Augt.

Agreed to Article VII from Sec: 1. to the paragraph "borrow money and emit bills on the credit of the united States inclusive, with the addition of the words "and post roads" and the omission of "*and emit bills*".

Mr. Martin appeared in convention.

August 17.

Agreed "to appoint a treasurer by joint Ballot; To constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme court; To make rules concerning captures on land and water;

expunged the next section and inserted

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas;

To punish counterfeiting the securities and the current coin of the United States.

Struck out the clause "To subdue a rebellion etc.

Debated the difference between a power to declare war; and to make war—amended by substituting declare—adjourned without a question on the clause.<sup>1</sup>

Augt. 18.

To make war, to raise armies "to build and equip fleets amended to "declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain fleets" to which was added "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

The next clause postponed.

August 20.

The following one agreed to.

Sect. 2. Amended to read. Treason against the U. S. shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies giving them aid and comfort. The legislature shall have power to declare the punishment of treason. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on confession in open court, or the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act.

Mr. Mason<sup>2</sup> moved to add to the 1 sect of the VII article.

To make sumptuary laws.

Gouverneur Morris. sump. laws were calculated to continue great landed estates for ever in the same families. If men had no temptation to dispose of their money they would not sell their estates.

Negatived.

Amended section 3 by striking out the words in the second line *white and other*, and the word six in the 5 line and substituting the word three—but adjourned without a question on the section.

<sup>1</sup> Not so the journal, *Documentary History*, I. 130.

<sup>2</sup> From "Mr. Mason" to "Negatived" inserted. Written on preceding page. The proper place for the insertion is however a paragraph earlier, according to the journal and Madison. *Ibid.*, 137, III. 567, 568.

Augt. 21.

passed the 3 sect.

Took up 4 sect. adjourned, after passing the first clause to the word State 2[d] line inclusive.<sup>1</sup>

August 22.

Committed the remainder of the 4 sect. with the 5 and 6.

The 4 sect promitting [permitting] the importation of Slaves gave rise to much desultory debate.

Every 5 slaves counted in representation as one elector without being equal in point of strength to one *white* inhabitant. This gave the slave States an advantage in representation over the others. The slaves were moreover exempt from duty on importation. They served to render the representation from such States aristocratical.<sup>2</sup>

It was replied—That the population or increase of slaves in Virginia exceeded their calls for their services—That a prohibition of Slaves into S. Carolina Georgia etc—would be a monopoly in their favor. These States could not do without Slaves. Virginia etc would make their own terms for such as they might sell. Such was the situation of the country that it could not exist without slaves—That they could confederate on no other condition. They had enjoyed the right of importing slaves when colonies. They enjoyed as States under the confederation. And if they could not enjoy it under the proposed government, they could not associate or make a part of it.

Several additions were reported by the committee.

Mr. Martin<sup>3</sup> shewed us some restrictory clauses drawn up for the VII article respecting commerce—which we agreed to bring forward.

Moved that the legislature should pass no ex post facto laws or bills of attainder.

G. Morris Willson Dr. Johnson etc thought the first an unnecessary guard as the principles of justice law et[c] were a perpetual bar to such. To say that the legis. shall not pass an ex post facto law is the same as to declare they shall not do a thing contrary to common sense—that they shall not cause that to be a crime which is no crime.

Carried in the affirmative.

August 23.

7 sect. agreed to.<sup>4</sup>

On motion, on a proposition reported and amended agreed that "*The legislature shall fulfil the engagements and discharge the debts of the U. S.*" To make the first clause in the VII article—Amended the first

<sup>1</sup> I. e., "No tax or duty shall be laid by the Legislature on articles exported from any State."

<sup>2</sup> These remarks cannot be identified with any individual speech in Madison's notes. What follows seems to be General C. C. Pinckney's statement. *Documentary History*, III. 587.

<sup>3</sup> This paragraph is inserted from the preceding page.

<sup>4</sup> After amendment.

clause in the report of the said article by striking out the words, *the legislature of the U. S.* Added in the said article after the clause "to provide and maintain fleets":

To organize and discipline the militia and govern such part of them as may be employed in the service of the U. S. reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by the U. S."

Expunged in the VIII article the words *the acts of the legislature of the U. S. and of this constitution*, so as that the constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof etc should be the supreme laws of the several States.

The IX. article being taken up, It was motioned that no treaty should be binding till it received the sanction of the legislature.

It was said<sup>1</sup> that a minister could not then be instructed by the Senate who were to appoint him, or if instructed there could be no certainty that the house of representatives would agree to confirm what he might agree to under these instructions.

To this it was answered<sup>2</sup> that all treaties which contravene a law of England or require a law to give them operation or effect are inconclusive till agreed to by the legislature of Great Britain.

Except in such cases the power of the King without the concurrence of the parliament conclusive.

Mr. Maddison.<sup>3</sup> the Kings power over treaties final and original except in granting subsidies or dismembering the empire. These required parliamentary acts.

Committed [*sic*].

Adjourned.

*Augt. 24.*

2 and 3 sect. struck out. The 10 article give rise to various debate. Amended to read that the election of the president of the U. S. be by *joint ballot*. It was moved to add each State having one vote—Conn: Jer. Mar. Georg.<sup>4</sup> ay. N. H. Mass. Penns. Vir. N. C. and S. C. no. It was moved that the president be elected by the people" 3 states affirm—7 neg.

On what respects his ineligibility Gov. Morris observed. That in the strength of the Executive would be found the strength of America. Ineligibility operates to weaken or destroy the constitution. The president will have no interest beyond his period of service. He will for peace and emolument to himself and friends agree to acts that will encrease the power and aggrandize the bodies which elect him. The legislature will swallow up the whole powers of the constitution; but

<sup>1</sup> By Mr. Gorham. *Documentary History*, III. 604.

<sup>2</sup> By Dr. Wilson. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Not in his notes. *Ibid.*, 606.

<sup>4</sup> And Delaware. *Ibid.*, I. 233.

<sup>5</sup> According to the journal and Madison, this second vote came first, and stood 2 to 9. *Ibid.*, 151, 152, 232, III. 609.

to do this effectually they must possess the Executive. This will lead them to tempt him, and the shortness of his reign will subject him to be tempted and overcome. The legislature has great and various appointments in their power. This will create them an extensive influence which may be so used as to put it out of the power of the Executive to prevent them from arriving at supremacy. On the other hand give the Executive a chance of being re-chosen and he will hold his prerogatives with all possible tenaciousness.

postponed the question.

Proceeded, and made some amendments to the 2 sect. Adjourned when the question was going to be put whether the legislature might enable the State Executives or legislatures to appoint officers to certain offices.

*Augt. 25.*

The clause in the 2 sect. X article, "he shall commission all the officers of the U. S. and shall appoint officers in all cases not otherwise provided for by this constitution, was moved to be amended by adding, except where by law the Executive of the several States shall have the power. Amendment negative[d]. Maryland divided—D. C. and J. against Martin and myself affirm.<sup>1</sup>

Moved several propositions<sup>2</sup> to restrict the legislature from giving any preference in duties, or from obliging duties to be collected in a manner injurious to any State, and from establishing new ports of entrance and clearance, unless neglected to be established by the States after application. Opposed by Massachusetts. Mr. Gorahm [*sic*] said it might be very proper to oblige vessels, for example, to stop at Norfolk on account of the better collection of the revenue.

Mr. King thought it improper to deliberate long on such propositions but to take the sense of the house immediately upon them.<sup>3</sup>

I moved to have them committed to a committee consisting of a member from each State. Committed.

Proceeded a little further in the 2 sect.

Mr. C. Pinkney gave notice that he would move that the consent of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the whole legislature be necessary to the enacting a law respecting the regulation of trade or the formation of a navigation act.<sup>4</sup>

Adjourned to monday.

*Monday 27 Augt.*

Amended the Presidential oath of office—made some other amendments—postponed what follows from the oath to the end.

Agreed to the 1. 2 and 3 sect. of the XI article with amendments.

<sup>1</sup> August 24, according to the journal and Madison, who says, *Documentary History*, III. 613, that it was negatived without a call of states, as also appears from the sheets of votes, *ibid.*, I. 233.

<sup>2</sup> Some of them by Dr. McHenry.

<sup>3</sup> This is not in Madison.

<sup>4</sup> This is not in Madison, who however reports Pinckney as proposing this on August 29, but with a two-thirds vote, not three-fourths. *Documentary History*, III. 636.

*Augt. 28.*

4 Sect. amended. 5 sect. agreed to.

XII article amended by adding that no State shall emit bills of credit, nor make any thing but specie a tender in debts.

XIII amended so [th]at all duties laid by a State shall accrue to the use of the U. S.

*Agt. 29.*

XIII and XV agreed to<sup>1</sup> XVI. article committed.

*Augt. 30.*

XVII article debated by Maryland. Obtained an alteration so that the claim of the U. S. to the Crown lands or Western territory may be decided upon by the supreme judiciary.

XVIII agreed to.<sup>2</sup>

Endeavoured to recall the house to the reported propositions from Maryland, to prevent the U. S. from giving preference to one State above another or to the shipping of one State above another, in collecting or laying duties. The house averse to taking any thing up till this system is got through.<sup>3</sup> XXI. adjourned on this article.

Proposed to have a private conference with each other to-morrow before meeting of the convention to take measures for carrying our propositions. etc.

*Augt. 31.*

Filled up the blank in the XXI article with 9: 8 States affirm: 3 Neg. Maryland moved to fill it up with 13 but stood alone on the question. G. W. was for 7.

Struck out *for their approbation* in the 22 Article. filled up the blank in the 23 article with 9, and amended the last clause by striking out *choose the president of the U. S. and.*

The system being thus far agreed to the restrictory propositions from Maryland<sup>4</sup> were taken up—and carried—against them N. Hamp. Massachusetts<sup>5</sup> and S. Carolina.

Referred to a grand committee all the sections of the system under postponement and a report of a committee of 5 with several motions.

Adjourned.

*Septmbr. 1.*

Adjourned to let the committee sit.

Sepr. 3. and 4 Employed chiefly by the committee.

Agreed on report of the com. that the 1 clause of the 1 sect. of the 7 art. read vz.

<sup>1</sup> August 28, according to the journal and Madison.

<sup>2</sup> The eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth articles were all agreed to on this day.

<sup>3</sup> This episode does not appear in Madison.

<sup>4</sup> As to equality of the states in respect to federal regulation of commerce and navigation.

<sup>5</sup> The vote of Massachusetts not given in the journal.

"The legislature shall have power to lay and collect taxes duties imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the U. S."

Also to add at the end of the 2 clause of the 1 sect of the 7 art. "and with the Indian tribes."

+ Took<sup>1</sup> up in the report "in the place of the 9 art. 1 sec.—"The senate of the U. S. shall have power to try all impeachments but no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of 2/3 of the members present. postponed.

The committee report in part as follows<sup>2</sup> . . .

After the words into the service of the U. S. in the 2 sect 10 art add "and may require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the Executive departments upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices.

The latter part of the 2 sect. 10 art. to read "he shall be removed from his office on impeachment by the house of representatives and conviction by the Senate, for treason, or bribery, and in case of his removal as aforesaid, death absence resignation or inability to discharge the powers or duties of his office, the vice pres. shall exercise those powers and duties until another pres. be chosen or until the inability of the pres. be removed.

No provision in the above for a new election in case of the death or removal of the President.

Upon looking over the constitution it does not appear that the national legislature can *erect light houses or clean out or preserve the navigation of harbours*. This expence ought to be borne by commerce—of course by the general treasury into which all the revenue of commerce must come.

Is it proper to declare all the navigable waters or rivers and within the U. S. common high ways? Perhaps a power to restrain any State from demanding tribute from citizens of another State in such cases is comprehended in the power to regulate trade between State and State.

This to be further considered. A motion to be made on the light house etc, to-morrow.

#### Sept. 5.

The greatest part of the day spent in desultory conversation on that part of the report respecting the mode of chusing the President. Adjourned without coming to a conclusion.

#### Sept. 6.

Spoke to Gov Morris Fitzimmons and Mr. Goram to insert a power in the confederation enabling the legislature to erect piers for protection of shipping in winter and to preserve the navigation of harbours. Mr.

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph inserted. Written on preceding page.

<sup>2</sup> Here follows the familiar report of the committee of eleven on the mode of electing the President, to be found in all prints of the journal, and therefore omitted here. See *Documentary History*, I. 177-179, III. 668-670.



Gohram against. The other two gentlemen for it. Mr. Gov: [*sic*] thinks it may be done under the words of the 1 clause 1 sect 7 art. amended—"and provide for the common defence and general welfare. If this comprehends such a power, it goes to authorise the legisl. to grant exclusive privileges to trading companies etc.

Mr. Willson remarked on the report of the committee considered together That it presented to him a most dangerous appearance. He was not affraid of names—but he was of aristocracy. What was the amount of the report.

1. The Senate in certain events, (which by such management as may be expected would always happen—) is to chuse the President.
2. The Senate may make treaties and alliances.
3. They may appoint almost all officers.
4. May try impeachments.

Montesqu says, an officer is the officer of those who appoint him. This power may in a little time render the Senate independent of the people. The different branches should be independent of each other. They are combined and blended in the Senate. The Senate may exercise, the powers of legislation, and Executive and judicial powers. To make treaties legislative, to appoint officers Executive for the Executive has only the nomination, To try impeachments judicial. If this is not ARISTOCRACY I know not what it is.

Gov. Morris observed that the report had lessened not increased the powers of the Senate. That their powers were greater in the printed paper.

Col Hamilton. In general the choice will rest in the Senate—take this choice from them and the report is an improvement on the printed paper. In the printed paper a destroying monster is created. He is not re eligible, he will therefore consider his 7 years as 7 years of lawful plunder. Had he been made re eligible by the legislature, it would not have removed the evil, he would have purchased his re election. At present the people may make a choice—but hereafter it is probable the choice of a president would centre in the Senate. As the report stands—the President will use the power of nominating to attach the Senate to his interest. He will act by this means continually on their hopes till at length they will both [*sic*] act as one body. Let the election of the president be confined to electors,<sup>1</sup> and take from the Senate the power to try impeachments, and the report will be much preferable to the printed paper.

He does not agree with those persons who say they will vote against the report because they cannot get all parts of it to please them. He will take any system which promises to save America from the dangers with which she is threatened.

<sup>1</sup> *i. e.*, by a provision that the highest number of electoral votes may elect, even though not a majority.

The report amended by placing the choice of the President in the house of representatives, each State having one vote.

Adjourned.

*Sepr. 7.*

Made some further progress in the report.

Mr. Mason<sup>1</sup> moved to postpone the section giving the President power to require the advice of the heads of the great departments to take up a motion—to appoint a council of State, to consist of 6 members—two from the Eastern, two from the middle and two from the Southern States—who should in conjunction with the President make all appointments and be an advisory body—to be elected by the legislature, to be in for 6 years with such succession as provided for the Senate.

3 States for postponing 8 against it—so it was lost.

Adjourned.

*Sepr. 8.*

Agreed to the whole report with some amendments—and refered the printed paper etc to a committee of 5 to revise and place the several parts under their proper heads—with an instruction to bring in draught of a letter to Congress.<sup>2</sup>

Committee	Gov. Morris
	Maddison
	Hamilton
	Dr. Johnson
	King—

Maryland gave notice that she had a proposition of much importance to bring forward—but would delay it till Monday it being near the hour to adjourn.<sup>3</sup>

*Monday Sepr. 10, 11 and 12.*

Spent in attempts to amend several parts of the system. 12—amended the sect art<sup>4</sup> from 3/4 to 2/3, as it stood in the printed report at first.

*13 Sepr.*

Recd. read and compared the new printed report with the first printed amended report. Made some verbal alterations, and inserted the propositions moved by Maryland which had been overlooked.

*14 Sepr.*

Moved by Dr. Franklin seconded by Mr. Willson, to empowe[r] Congress to open and establish canals. This being objected to—moved

<sup>1</sup> The printed journal, ed. 1819, attributes this motion to Madison. The latter corrects this in his notes. *Documentary History*, III. 701.

<sup>2</sup> This instruction appears in the journal under September 10, in a form requiring the preparation of an address to the people, to be laid before Congress.

<sup>3</sup> Of this episode there appears to be no record elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> Section 13 of article vi. of the report of the Committee of Detail, dealing with the President's veto.

by Virginia To empower Congress to grant charters of incorporation in cases where the U. S. may require them and where the objects of them cannot be obtained by a State.

Negatived.

Moved To authorize Congress to establish an university to which and the honors and emoluments of which all persons may be admitted without any distinction of religion whatever. Congress enabled to erect such an institution in the place of the general government. Thus Congress to possess exclusive jurisdiction.

Neg. 6 Noes. 3 ay.<sup>1</sup> 1 State divided.

Moved—And the liberty of the press shall be inviolable. 6 noes. 5 ays.<sup>2</sup>

15 Sepr.

Maryland moved.<sup>3</sup>

No State shall be prohibited from laying such duties of tonnage as may be sufficient for improving their harbors and keeping up lights, but all acts laying such duties shall be subject to the approbation or repeal of Congress.

Moved to amend it viz. No State without the consent of Congress shall lay a duty of tonnage. Carried in the affirmative 6 ays 4 Noes, 1 divided.

Made several verbal amendment[s] in the progression on the system.

Added to the V article amended "No State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Mr. Mason moved in substance that no navigation act be passed without the concurrence of 2/3 of the members present in each house.

Negatived.

Mr. Randolp[h] moved that it be recommended to appoint a second convention with plenary powers to consider objections to the system and to conclude one binding upon the States.

rejected unanimously.

The question being taken on the system agreed to unanimously.

Ordered to be engrossed and 500 copies struck.<sup>4</sup> Adjourned till monday the 17th.

*Monday 17 Sepr. 1787.*

Read the engrossed constitution. Altered the representation in the house of representatives from 40 to thirty thousand.

Dr. Franklin put a paper into Mr. Willsons hand to read containing his reasons for assenting to the constitution. It was plain, insinuating persuasive—and in any event of the system guarded the Doctors fame.

Mr. Randolp[h] Mr. Mason and Mr. Gerry declined signing. The other members signed.

<sup>1</sup> Four noes, according to Madison.

<sup>2</sup> So the printed journal, though Madison has it 4 to 7.

<sup>3</sup> McHenry and Carroll, according to Madison. *Documentary History*, III. 751.

<sup>4</sup> The number is not elsewhere mentioned, I believe.

Being<sup>1</sup> opposed to many parts of the system I make a remark why I signed it and mean to support it.

1s[t]ly I distrust my own judgement, especially as it is opposite to the opinion of a majority of gentlemen whose abilities and patriotism are of the first cast; and as I have had already frequent occasions to be convinced that I have not always judged right.

2dly Alterations may be obtained, it being provided that the concurrence of 2/3 of the Congress may at any time introduce them.

3dly Comparing the inconveniences and the evils which we labor under and may experience from the present confederation, and the little good we can expect from it—with the possible evils and probable benefits and advantages promised us by the new system, I am clear that I ought to give it all the support in my power.

Philada. 17 Sept. 1787 James McHenry.

Major Jackson Secry. to carry it to Congress. Injunction of secrecy taken off. Members to be provided with printed copies. adjourned sine die. Gentn. of Con. dined together at the City Tavern.

18—

A lady asked Dr. Franklin Well Doctor what have we got a republic or a monarchy. A republic replied the Doctor if you can keep it. [(Foot-note by McHenry.) The lady here aluded to was Mrs. Powel of Philada.]

Mr. Martin<sup>2</sup> said one day in company with Mr. Jenifer speaking of the system before Convention.

I'll be hanged if ever the people of Maryland agree to it. I advise you said Mr. Jenifer to stay in Philadelphia lest you should be hanged.<sup>3</sup>

## II.

[The following drafts of amendments are found on scraps of paper in McHenry's handwriting in the journal. They are obviously drafts of the amendment presented by McHenry and Carroll on September 15; see p. 617, *supra*.]

provided that any state may lay additional duties on shipping for the support of Lights, piers marks or Buoys or for the deepening or improvement of Harbours.

The legislature shall have power to erect piers buoys or marks and to deepen or clean harbours for facilitating or improving navigation—

No State shall be prohibited from laying such duties of tonnage as may be sufficient for improving their harbours and keeping up lights or buoys, but all acts laying such duties shall be subject to the approbation or repeal of Congress. Amended. 6 ay. 4 noes. 1 divided.

<sup>1</sup> From here to McHenry's signature is written on the preceding page in different ink.

<sup>2</sup> The anecdote of Martin is an insert written on the preceding page.

<sup>3</sup> End of book.

[Also the following, not written by McHenry. Except for its last twenty words, it is identical with the amendment moved on August 25 by Carroll and Luther Martin. *Documentary History*, III. 619.]

The Legislature of the United States shall not oblige Vessels belonging to Citizens thereof, or to foreigners to enter or pay duties or imposts in any other State than in that to which they may be bound, or to clear out in any other than the State in which their Cargoes may be laden on board; Nor shall any privilege, or immunity be granted to any Vessels on entering clearing out or paying duties or imposts in one State in preference to another—Nor shall vessels owned by Citizens of one State have any preference of vessels owned by Citizens of another State.

### III.<sup>1</sup>

Copy of what Col. Mercer gave me<sup>2</sup> at Annapolis during the sitting of the Assembly.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Mercer had during the sitting of the Convention at Pha. a list of the members of that body taken down on the printed Constitution, and against their names, these words—for and against. Mr. McHenry seeing it (without its being shewn to him) at the table where the Members from the State sat copied it without the leave or interference of Mr. Mercer and added Mr. Mercers name with those of Mr. Martin and himself—as against. Mr. Mercer asked him what authority he had for setting him down against. Mr. McHenry made some reply rather in a

<sup>1</sup> Nos. III., IV., V., VI., and VII. are from papers in the handwriting of Daniel Carroll found with the McHenry volume.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Carroll.

<sup>3</sup> The session of the Assembly of Maryland began (nominally) on November 5, and ended on December 17, 1787. The transactions to which this and the subsequent pieces refer are illustrated by the following passage from a letter of Daniel Carroll to James Madison, dated May 28, 1788, and printed in the *Documentary History*, IV. 638: "It has come to light that Luther Martin in his Tavern harangues among the members during the sitting of that Assembly had informd many of them that more than 20 Members of the Convention were in favor of a Kingly Government, and that he received the information from Mr McHenry who had a list of their names on the 1st printed report of the Committee of Detail. This possitive assertion under the weight of Mr McHenrys name had the effect I have mentiond [of preventing Carroll's being elected to the Congress]. Some time after the breaking up of the Assembly being informd of what Martin had said, I wrote to Mr McHenry who gave for answer, that seeing a list of names on Mr Mercers report, he copied it and ask'd him what the words *for* and *against* meant, who replied, *for* a Kingly Governmt. *against* it. I wrote to Mr McHenry that as I had been injurd by his names being mentiond I desird he wou'd take a proper occasion whilst the Convention was sitting of having justice done me. He has answerd that on speaking to Mercer, on the Subject, he told him that he meant a National Govt., to which McHenry says, 'I do not know what you meant, but you said a Kingly Govert.' This Mercer denies and has given from under his hand that he neither said Kingly or National Govt. I have a letter from Luther Martin wherein he says he had the information from McHenry (without Mercer being mentiond) who told him he might rely on the persons being as markd for a Kingly Govt. Thus this matter rests at present—it is to be setteld between McHenry and Martin on one point, and him and Mercer on another."

light manner—that he had left Mr. Mercer room to change side, or to that effect. Some conversation took place but not of so serious a nature, as to make any impression on Mr. Mercers memory, but he is persuaded that he entered into no explanation of the list to authorize Mr. McHenry to say the members were markd as for a *Kingly* or *national* Government, and the list being on the Constitution with the words for and against and nothing else, Mr. McHenry cou'd have no authority from that. Mr. Mercer and Mr. McHenry\* were not in the habit of Confidential communication—nor has Mr. Mercer ever mentioned any political opinion as the opinion of Mr. D. Carroll to any one. In a variety of private conversations it is probable he receiv'd the opinions of almost every Member in Convention, but he has never related more than what came from them in debate. At that moment the Cant expression was *high toned* Government which superceeded the usual descriptions of Monarchy, Aristocracy, or Democracy and which perswades Mr. Mercer that the word Kingly could never have been used by him.

But as Mr. Martins information to Mr. Mercer of what passd between him and Mr. McHenry fixes it, that Mr. McHenry told him, that he knew it of his own knowledge and from his acquaintance with the Characters, Mr. Mercer thinks that Mr. McHenry has very improperly introduc'd him into the business.

## IV.

Extracts from Mr. McHenrys Letter to me<sup>1</sup> dated the 9th of Jan'y 88

Nothing that Mr. Martin can say can make me uneasy, or give me any Surprize. I will tell you in a few words the ground of his misrepresentation. I observ'd Mr. Mercer one day in Convention taking down the names of the members on a blank side of his report and affixing to most of them the word for or against. I askd him what question occasiond his being so particular, upon which he told me, it was no question, but those markd with a for were in favor of Monarchy. How do you learn that? No matter said he the thing is so. I then ask'd him to let me copy it, and Mr. Martin took a copy from mine, which was also on a blank page of my report. This is the whole history, and you may make what use of it you please.

## V.

The following is a copy [of] Mr. Martins letter to me<sup>1</sup> in consequence of what passd between us on Col. Mercer's calling him to me, at the time we were in conversation—

May 20th. 1788

Agreeable to your request I here present you the Substance of our this days conversation—

Sometime after Mr. McHenrys return to Convention conversing on the System then under discussion, and of the object and views of the

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Carroll.

Members of the Convention, Mr. McHenry told me that a very considerable Number of them were in favour of a Monarchical Government (under certain limitations and restrictions as I concluded) and shewed me a list of the then attending Members from each State marked with the words *for* and *against*, to distinguish such as were for or against such a Government; this list was written on a blank page of his printed report of the Committee of detail, and I copied it on a blank page of mine with the same distinctive marks—more than twenty were noted in the list as being in favour of a Monarchy, among those was your name.

I observ'd to Mr. McHenry that as to many of them I perfectly concurd in opinion, but as to some, I thought he was mistaken—he replied I might depend upon it, he was better informd on the Subject, and better knew their sentiments than I did, and that every one who was there distinguish'd [*sic*] in favor of a King was so in reality; Mr. McHenry did not mention to me particularly whom [*sic*] he drew the inference or how he had obtaind the Knowledge or the belief which he express'd, but I naturally concluded that it proceeded from the Sentiments he had heard them express, from information which had been given to him by others or from their Conduct in Convention, or from all these Sources combin'd. I have no possible recollection that Col Mercers name was mentiond to me on that or any other occasion by Mr. McHenry as having given him any information on the Subject, on the contrary, I well remember that I was surprizd when I heard Col Mercers name lately mentiond on the occasion, as being totally unacquainted with his sentiments on that Subject, and as being ignorant that he had ever expressd such Sentiments. And I am well convinc'd from the fullest recollection and reflection that Mr. McHenry did not mention to me any person in particular from whom he had receiv'd the information or who had impressd on his mind the opinion he at that time entertaind.

At the time we were before the Assembly to give information<sup>1</sup> Mr. McHenry's report of the Committee with other papers were laying on the Table, at that time the list I have mention'd was upon it; And as Mr. McHenry endeavour'd to impress an Idea that there cou'd be no foundation for my Sentiment, that tho' but few members openly avowed their being for a Monarchical Government, yet there were a much greater number who secretly favord that System, I with difficulty restraind myself from laying my hands upon it, and producing it to the Assembly as a proof that he had himself once entertaind Similar Sentiments, altho' he might since be convinced of his error.—

The foregoing is a just State of what passd between Mr. McHenry and myself on the Subject concerning which you expressd a desire that I wou'd give you information, and you have my full permission to make any use of it which you may think proper.

I am sr. yr. Obt Sert.

Copy.

LUTHER MARTIN

<sup>1</sup> See Martin's *Genuine Information*.

## VI.

The following is from a Scrip of paper sent me<sup>1</sup> by my Brother<sup>2</sup> from Mr. McHenry—

I mentiond to Mr. Mercer, at the Governors that Mr. Danl. Carroll had been made very uneasy by Mr. Martins having reported, that when in Convention he had been for a Kingly Government, and related the Substance of what I had written to Mr. Carroll on that Subject. Mr. Mercer replied that he had put down no such thing opposite the names, and that he only meant that those which had *for* annex'd to them were for a national Government. I said I did not know what he meant, but that he told me in Convention when I copied the names from his paper that those mark'd for were for a King. He spoke of Mr. Martins having acted improperly on this occasion and some others.

## VII.

DANIEL CARROLL TO REVEREND JOHN CARROLL.

June 11th. 1788.

*Dear Brother,*

The inclosd<sup>3</sup> is for Mr. McHenry. During a long course of Public Service, I have never before heard of any imputation being cast on my conduct. This is of a nature which woud deservedly deprive me of the confidence of the Public, at least. My character I hold dear, and will maintain it against attempts to injure it. Where the blame is, I will not undertake to determine. I did not conceive it probable, that such a paper as is mentiond in Mr. McHenry's Letter of the 9th of Jany. could have been circulated among some of the deputies from Maryland without my privity, much less, that Mr. McHenry woud furnish Mr. Martin with one with my name to it. Untill lately I woud not believe that my name was on that list.

Dear Brother

*Yrs etca—*

DANL CARROLL.

[Address:] The Revd. Mr. John Carroll.

## VIII.

JAMES MCHENRY TO REVEREND JOHN CARROLL.<sup>4</sup>

BALTIMORE 16 June 1788.

I have read Mr. Martins and Mr. Mercers information to Mr. D. Carroll. With respect to their statements, I can only subjoin, to what I have already written to Mr. Carroll, that I copied the list in question with Mr. Mercers permission, without adding any thing of my own or

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Carroll.

<sup>2</sup> Father John Carroll, afterward bishop and archbishop of Baltimore.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently the matter printed above as III., IV., V., and VI., all four of which are found transcribed on one sheet among the papers.

<sup>4</sup> Nos. VIII. and IX. are rough drafts of two letters of James McHenry, written in his handwriting, on one sheet, folded and addressed.



altering any thing of his, which may be ascertained by comparing the two together; and that on Mr. Merc[e]rs changing his seat to another part of the house, Mr. Martin asked me, what I had been copying, and without waiting for an answer took up my report and read over the list. I told him, I had copied it from a list made out by Mr. Mercer, and that the names having *for* annexed to them, Mr. Mercer said, were for a king. Mr. Martin asked me to let him take a copy, and I permitted it, and this was *all* the conversation I held then or at any other time with Mr. Martin on that subject.

This relation is copied in substance from my note book of the transactions of the convention, which I wrote down daily,<sup>1</sup> and is besides fresh in my memory so that there can be no mistake upon my part. I did not shew the list to Mr. Carroll or Mr. Jenifer or any other person (except Martin who got it by surprise), because I took it only with a view to relate the circumstances attending its origin in case it should ever be brought forward to answer improper purposes; nor have I at any time since mentioned any thing respecting either the list or its object,<sup>2</sup> to any person whatever but Mr. D. Carroll and his brother.

Mr. D. Carroll has my consent to make what use he may think proper of the above.

JAMES MCHENRY.

IX.

JAMES MCHENRY TO REVEREND JOHN CARROLL.

BALTIMORE 16 June 1788.

*Dr. Sir,*

You have been so kind as to put your brothers letter into my hand. I have read it attentively and cannot help thinking that he has looked for an illustration where his own experience might have taught him it could not possibly be found. He doubts where the blame lays. When did Mr. Martin and Mr. Mercer become authorities? He suggests also that I should have made him acquainted with the list. If I had shewn it to him, I must have shewn it to others who were equally affected by it, with some of whom I have been for these thirteen years past in the closest habits of intimacy and friendship. Such a step, he must be aware, would have brought on immediate personal altercations (at a most critical time) with a man prone to anger, and excessively captious. I did what I thought much safer and more decisive. I reserved myself to expose it publicly in case a public use had been made of it. This has never been done tho' the fairest opportunity in the world was offred for doing it. Can any one who witnessed that occasion, who heard me charge Mr. Martin with uttering falsehoods, entertain a belief that his

<sup>1</sup> The words "which I wrote down daily" are an insertion in the text of the draft. By reference to p. 604, *supra*, it will be seen that McHenry's account of the episode in the Convention which caused this imbroglio is an insertion in his diary.

<sup>2</sup> The words "its object" are crossed out, probably by mistake.

representation to Mr. Carroll is true, or that he would have remained silent and condemned before the general assembly if he could have given me as an evidence of what he there asserts? As to Mr. Mercer, I wish your brother had mentioned what he has recently done or said that has induced him to think more favorably of his veracity.

I have only to regret in this affair that my anxiety for the public good and your brothers quiet, for whom I have the most sincere friendship, should have occasioned him a moments uneasiness, and am only surprised that he has not treated this as he has the other fictions which have been gravely reported to the world for truths.

I am very respectfully

Sir Your obt. and hble st.

JAMES MCHENRY

[Address:] Revd. John Carroll Esqr.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*A History of All Nations from the Earliest Times.* General Editor, JOHN HENRY WRIGHT, LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. Volumes III., *Ancient Greece*, IV., *Republican Rome*, and V., *Imperial Rome*. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Company. 1905. Pp. 431, 331, 326.)

THE first two volumes of this series, which is to consist of twenty-four, were reviewed by Professor Toy in the number of this REVIEW for October, 1905 (XI. 117-118). The general description of the whole series given there need not be repeated here. The three volumes noted here are meant to be, like all the first nineteen volumes of the series, "a carefully edited translation, slightly condensed, with additions", of the corresponding volumes in Flathe's *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*. These were written by Professor G. F. Hertzberg of Halle, and were practically nothing more than condensations of his *Hellas und Rom*, in two volumes, and his *Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreiches*, published in 1879 and 1880 as parts of Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte*.

The original volumes, when published, constituted the best popular history of classical antiquity in German. They were prepared by a scholar who, if not an independent authority in the field, was thoroughly acquainted with the latest and best original work there, and who had a notable experience and power in popularizing scientific researches. They were unencumbered with learned apparatus, and yet reflected the latest investigations, and were presented "in a form to excite the interest of all intelligent readers". By means of brief foot-notes the Flathe edition of 1885-1886 corrected here and there the Oncken edition of 1879-1880, but otherwise was the same, except for being much condensed.

The task of putting these volumes into fitting English, and at the same time of bringing them up to date after twenty years of research and discovery, was a serious one. In many ways it would have been easier to rewrite the whole story. The new material might then have been incorporated into the work, instead of for the most part taking the form of appendixes, added paragraphs, and additional foot-notes. But, assuming the wisdom of the task, it has been well performed. We still need, however, a popular history of antiquity on the general plan of Eduard Meyer's *Geschichte des Alterthums*, where the history of the ancient world, and especially that of the Balkan and Apennine peninsulas, is treated in parallel chronological layers, after the manner of the more recent excavations.

Volume III., *Ancient Greece*, is translated and condensed from the original by Professor Charles Forster Smith of the University of Wisconsin. Entirely new are the concluding paragraphs of chapter II., pp. 47-55, prepared on the basis of the opening chapter of Bury's *History of Greece* (1900), and Dörpfeld's *Troja und Ilion* (1902). They represent succinctly the "vast contributions" which "archaeological research within the last decade has made . . . to our knowledge of the early history of the civilization on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean". New also is the appendix, pp. 411-421, on the recent Cretan excavations, especially those at Knossos and Phaestus. Both these additions are richly illustrated from the latest photographs, and are the work of Professor William Nickerson Bates of the University of Pennsylvania, whose name appears as associate editor on the title-page of the volume. Until scholars are more agreed as to the relations of this newly found Cretan culture to that so long known as "Mycenaean", it is well, perhaps, that the evidence merely is presented, without definite deductions from it.

Other adaptations of the old to the new edition consist mainly in slight changes in or corrections of the original German text; in brief foot-notes; and in generous additions of illustrative material. An example of the first is the change (p. 127) in the date of Cylon's attempt upon the Acropolis from 612 B. C. to "before 620 B. C.", without, however, putting the narrative into its proper position before the story of Draco's activity. The mere change of date is hardly enough. It will doubtless seem to many that the chronology of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* has been adopted with too much confidence in other cases.

Good examples of the general editor's foot-notes, supplementing or correcting the original text, may be seen at pp. 105, 143, 217, 288, 376, and 390. Almost all are imperatively called for by the advance in knowledge since the original text was prepared. Perhaps their number and importance may be thought to emphasize anew the danger of putting new wine into old bottles.

For most of the added illustrations the scholar as well as the general reader will be thankful, and also for the carefully detailed explanations of them. Some are of rare beauty and great importance, as, for instance, the vase-painting of Croesus on the Funeral Pile (p. 157), the Darius vase (plate IX.), and the beautiful vase-paintings in color (plates V., VI., and VIII.). On the other hand, it is to be regretted that so much of the old illustrative material has been kept, or furbished up, when clearly past its usefulness, as, for instance, the coarse cuts of the Naples Tyrannicides (pp. 140, 141), or of the "Marathonian Soldier" (p. 179), or of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Euripides (after Visconti, pp. 256, 290). In all these cases good fresh photographs are accessible. And what scholar can welcome the hypaethral restorations of the temples of Athena and Zeus (p. 89 and plate XVI.)?

Volume IV., *Republican Rome*, is translated by Professor John K. Lord, of Dartmouth College. The original, published in 1879 and 1885,

was the conventional and standard popular history, steering on the whole impartially between the opposing schools among the followers of Niebuhr, and not too much influenced by the radical views of Mommsen. Greater freedom in this last regard might possibly have been exercised by the translator, as, for instance, in rejecting the note (p. 88) on the genuineness of the earliest commercial treaty between Rome and Carthage. Eduard Meyer upholds its genuineness (*Geschichte des Alterthums*, II. § 500).

There was, of course, much less to be done in the way of bringing the material of this volume up to date than in the preceding one. Even the vexed Etruscan questions of chapter 1: have not received much additional light since 1885, and therefore require no such supplementary treatment as the corresponding "Mycenaean" questions of the *Ancient Greece*. The illustrations of Etruscan monuments are, however, somewhat fuller and richer in the English edition. Especially welcome are the additions of the beautiful colored plate 1., representing a sepulchral wall-painting, and of figure 6, a sepulchral stele. On the other hand, the retention of the old illustration of the walls of the Palatine (figure 12) is, in view of the abundance of recent photographs, inexplicable; and both the (old) plate 1x. and the (new) figure 44 are hopelessly out of date. Far less has been done for this volume in the way of improving its illustrations than for the one before it.

Volume V., *Imperial Rome*, is also translated by Professor Lord, and differs even less from its German original than its companion volume, *Republican Rome*. The story closes with the permanent division of the Empire in 395 A. D., leaving the description of the breaking up of the Western Empire to the succeeding volume of the series. An exceedingly valuable supplementary chapter (pp. 257-274) on Latin Literature from Paulus to Claudian, *i. e.*, from about 200 A. D. to 400 A. D., is contributed by Mr. George W. Robinson of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and fills a gap of nearly two centuries which the German series unaccountably left in its sketch of the intellectual life of the Roman world.

All three volumes show great improvement on the German original in the continuous numbering of chapters and "Parts" through the successive "Books", and in the admirable "Analytical Contents" of each chapter supplied by the general editor at the end of each volume. Volume V. also supplies an elaborate series of "Chronological Tables", to illustrate Oriental as well as Greek and Roman history, and supplementing, therefore, all the first five volumes of the series. The Egyptian chronology already needs correction to accord with the system established by Eduard Meyer ("Aegyptische Chronologie", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Classe, 1904) and adopted by Breasted in the latest *History of Egypt*. So impossible is it to have a book up-to-date for long.

B. PERRIN.

*A History of All Nations from the Earliest Times.* General editor, JOHN HENRY WRIGHT, LL.D., Professor in Harvard University. Volumes VI., *The Great Migrations*, VII., *The Early Middle Ages*, and VIII., *The Age of Charlemagne*. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Company. 1905. Pp. 415, 416, 332.)

THE publishers of this series have performed a real service in making a good universal history at last accessible to English readers. It is not likely that the general history will ever come to occupy in America the place which the German *Weltgeschichte* holds beside the family Bible, and those who have but a modest sum to spend on historical books may well find it wiser to get individual histories of distinguished excellence rather than comprehensive collections whose quality can never be of the highest. Still, general histories are sure to be bought, and it is much to be desired that they be works of real scholarship, like the *History of All Nations*, and not the dreary and untrustworthy compilations which have hitherto had possession of the field in English.

Of the three volumes discussed in this review, volumes VI. and VII. are by Dr. Julius von Pflugk-Harttung, Archivist of the Prussian Royal State Archives, formerly professor of history at the University of Basel, volume VIII. by Dr. Hans Prutz, professor of history in the University of Königsberg. The two volumes of Pflugk-Harttung are among the best of the series, and although subject to some correction from the progress of knowledge in the twenty years which have elapsed since they were begun, they can be commended to the teacher of history as well as to the general reader as one of the best accounts of the early Middle Ages to be found within the same limits of space. A specialist in the field of papal diplomatics, the author evidently succeeded in acquainting himself with the sources of information for the other phases of his subject, notably in the direction of prehistoric archaeology, to which more attention is given than is usual in books of history. The conditions of society among the early Germans and their relations with Rome are taken up with considerable fullness, nearly one-half of the first volume being given to the period before the great invasions. In relation to the work as a whole this seems rather disproportionate, but it should be welcomed because of the meagreness of material in English on this part of the field. The account of the migrations and the German kingdoms on Roman soil is not limited to conventional narrative, but the interaction of the two civilizations is emphasized, and special chapters deal with the institutions and culture of the new states. The church, on the other hand, hardly comes sufficiently into the foreground, and the Greek empire and Islam are dismissed with two scant chapters at the end. The brief description of the sources prefixed to the various sections is a praiseworthy feature. The principal general criticisms to be made upon the work are that the general plan involves some repetition and that the outlines are not always drawn with enough distinctness.

Prutz's *Age of Charlemagne* could be more appropriately discussed in connection with the following volumes of which he is the author. The title is misleading, since the volume extends to 1056 and gives but seventy pages to Charlemagne. The treatment is for the most part the conventional narrative of Frankish and German history, with two brief and inadequate summaries of civilization and a chapter on the East. As in most German histories, the account of the break-up of the Carolingian empire is vitiated by modern ideas of race and nationality, instead of being studied from the point of view of the ninth century; as when we are told that the partition of Verdun was "made pretty closely along national lines" (p. 134), and that the portions of Lotharingia "which were thus torn from their proper national environment [by the treaty of Meerssen] strove to free themselves from this compulsory union with a foreign people, and to renew their connection with those of their own race" (p. 138).

The work of translation has been done with only moderate success. The style of the German popular history does not readily lend itself to English, even under the most flexible hands, and the hands of the translators have not always been flexible. It is not, for example, hard to see the German original behind a sentence like the following, where it is said of Gregory of Tours, "No other German people enjoys an approximately equal delineator of their inner life" (VII. 64). Here and there serious blunders betray an imperfect knowledge of German. Thus the paragraph on the early German codes (VII. 259) is made even more confusing than the original by translating *sonst* "furthermore", and by assuming—not unnaturally—from Pflugk-Harttung's statement that there are no extant manuscripts of the *Lex Frisionum* and the *Edict of Theodoric*, that these codes have been lost. The "Münster zu Aachen" becomes the "cathedral at Münster" (VIII. 83), and in the Ommiad empire the "drei Erdtheile" between the Pyrenees and the Indus (VII. 407) appear as "three-quarters of the globe"!

The illustrations call for special praise, as they are reproductions of actual objects of the period, drawn in great profusion from a variety of authentic sources—manuscripts, coins, buildings, and archaeological remains of every sort. They have been recognized as one of the most valuable features of the German original, and nowhere else, least of all in a universal history, is so much valuable illustrative material for the study of this age placed before the English reader. There are also a number of maps. Each volume has an analytical table of contents, prepared by the editor, but lacks an index, a defect which is not atoned for by the promise of an index-volume to the series.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*Dix Leçons sur le Martyre données à l'Institut Catholique de Paris.*  
 Par PAUL ALLARD. Préface de Mgr. PÉCHENARD, Recteur de  
 l'Institut Catholique. (Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 1906. Pp.  
 xxxii, 373, no index.)

THE lectures here published were delivered early last spring at the Catholic Institute of Paris by a scholar well known for his valuable contributions to the history of the early church, including five volumes on the history of the persecutions in the first four centuries, and the work entitled *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain de Néron à Théodose*. The field covered is the two hundred and fifty years between Nero and Constantine, when Christianity was struggling for existence and recognition. During about half of this time, according to M. Allard's computation, the Christians suffered intermittent persecution; at its end they were granted toleration by a series of imperial edicts. The book before us contributes little that is new to our knowledge. The sources had already been diligently explored, both by the author himself and by several other scholars (Boissier, Mommsen, Neumann, Harnack, Hardy, Spence), and the main facts repeatedly published. We have here, however, a comprehensive and useful summary of the available information, from the hand of a specialist, written with the grace that we are accustomed to expect from French savants, however technical their theme. "Il me semble que j'en ai à peine effleuré le sujet" (p. 366) is overmodest. There is no occasion to apologize for the book; it is sure of a welcome.

The contents, arranged topically and not always in the order one might have expected, include the geographical expansion of the church, the antichristian measures of various emperors, the legal aspects of their proceedings, the causes of persecution, the number of the martyrs and their social position, descriptions of the trials and punishments, the tests of constancy, and the evidential value of the martyrs' testimony. The author believes the number who suffered death before the reign of Decius was larger than would seem to be indicated by Origen's statement (*Contra Celsum*, III. 8), taking issue on this point with Harnack (*Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 345). It is difficult to reach a very positive conclusion, in view of the indefiniteness of the records. But there is no doubt that very many suffered death under Decius, Valerian, Diocletian, and his successors.

M. Allard rejects the well-known view of Mommsen and others that there was no special early antichristian legislation, but that magistrates proceeded against the Christians either under the *lex majestatis* or by virtue of their police powers (*coercitio*). He holds, with Boissier, that there was an ancient imperial enactment, perhaps from the reign of Nero, to this effect, "christiani non sint", and that this formed the basis of all subsequent proceedings. "Avant les rescrits de Marc Aurèle, d'Hadrien, de Trajan, existait une loi initiale—*ἀρχαῖος νόμος*, selon



l'expression d'Eusèbe—qui défendait d'être chrétien, et dont ces rescrits règlent, éclairent ou tempèrent l'application" (p. 92). But the "ancient law", referred to by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* V. 21), which required that accused persons refusing to recant should be punished, is not limited to Christians; apparently it was designed to cover a much wider variety of cases. It is true that Tertullian seems to refer to some such ancient law (*Apol.* 4), yet in very general terms and without attempting to assign it any date. And elsewhere he says explicitly, "sacrilegii et majestatis rei convenimur. summa haec causa, immo tota est" (*Apol.* 10). Trajan's order to Pliny, "conquirendi non sunt" (*Epist.* X. 97), is hardly compatible with the theory that an existing law forbade Christians to exist, for in that case a Roman governor could have had no option; he must "seek them out". The author's view remains a mere hypothesis, and not a very probable one at that. But he recognizes that the decision of the question is after all a matter of small importance for such a treatment of the subject as he is here endeavoring to give.

JOHN WINTHROP PLATNER.

*Julian the Apostate.* By GAETANO NEGRI. Translated from the second Italian édition by the Duchess LITTA-VISCONTI-ARESE, with an introduction by Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Two vols., pp. xxxiv, 320; vi, 321-636.)

THE author of this richly instructive and eloquent work virtually makes his own comment upon it in his preface (I. xxiv): "We should reconstruct, as far as possible, in History the human drama, relive in thoughts, in sentiments, and in passions the life of a human being during a specified period of time, and during a specified conflict of hopes and fears, of anger and affections, of illusions and reality." These words might have been written by George Eliot, and Villari's introduction to the present work tells us (I. xiii) that George Eliot "was the writer who evoked Negri's most unlimited admiration". Although, then, English readers are already provided with able studies on the life and character of the Emperor Julian in Wordsworth's article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, in Rendall's work (1879), and in the more recent and most excellent book by Alice Gardner (1895), there are special and distinguished merits in Gaetano Negri's treatment which should insure a welcome to this English version.

Villari's interesting introduction informs the foreign reader of the political and literary career of Negri and indicates the philosophical and religious beliefs which drew him to such a subject and determined the judgments and sympathies of his exposition. Negri was a positivist with a leaning to faith, and his work bears the impress of an exalted character. He has written a genuinely historical work on Julian, with *Quellenkritik* and patient narrative detail, but his main interest is in discussing the man in his historical situation, his ideals and methods.

his motives and character, and the wisdom of his dramatic and visionary attempt to establish a "puritan polytheism". The work is, therefore, far more than a biographical study. The reader obtains a complete explanatory account of the whole spiritual situation of the century in which Julian lived, and it will be read with keen interest by the student of church history and of the history of philosophy. In the preface Negri, indeed, speaks of his work as a study of Christianity. He does not contribute any new body of fact for the church historian, but he gives a vivid picture of the moral conditions of the Christianized empire and a brilliant and illuminating construction of the doctrinal development whether Christian or Neoplatonic. What Harnack means by the secularization of Christianity in the Hellenic world is here made into a concrete and unforgettable picture. Negri views Julian's attempt to revive Hellenism as "a symptom and a proof of the corruption into which Christianity had fallen" (II. 630), but, positivist as he was, is keenly appreciative of a purity of genuine inspiration in the original Christianity which was justly victorious by its "response . . . to the most profound needs of the human conscience" (I. xxii). However, an element of exaggeration or of inaccuracy belongs to this language about the corruption of Christianity. The discourse of Libanius (II. 467) makes it clear that in Antioch there was Christian conviction and sincerity among the women and the poorer classes, and that the moral insufficiency complained of was the characteristic of citizens who had, since the state establishment of Christianity, become nominal converts without having yet yielded to its moral power. On page 606 we have a recognition of purer elements who withdrew from a church mixed with the world to a monastic life in which the religious ideal could be realized. The lack of moral earnestness in pagan circles recently enrolled in a state church from motives of worldly policy is not accurately named a corruption of Christianity. Were it the case that Julian had found any energetic moral support from paganism, Negri would not have exaggerated in speaking (I. xxiii) of the Emperor as concentrating, "in the focus of a single person, all the passions that have determined the direction, and provoked the attitude, of the human soul in a given moment of its evolution". The interest of the treatment is not confined to problems of faith and ideals of culture. Experienced in the practical politics of Milan, Negri discusses with acuteness and ingenuity the Emperor's policy in a very practical fashion. By a *tour de force* the problem raised by Julian's school law is made to illustrate the secularization of the Christianity of the times, and the Emperor is justified by a brief but striking discussion of the principles involved in recent French legislation.

The work is diffuse, and even repetitious, but never tiresome. As Villari remarks, it has occasional exaggerations but teems with originality. Without a knowledge of the original, one may believe the translator to have been for the most part successful. In a few passages "he" and "his" require close inspection in order to determine which of

two persons is meant; and in a few cases syntax and meaning are far from clear, as, "He, therefore, has this canal reopened", etc. (I. 125). Here and in the following pages the use of the historical present is distasteful. In a line from the Iliad (II. 445), the Homeric society is made fashionable by "excellent dancers at the balls" (*χρηστὸν πῖπτον*). Apart from a few such blemishes, the version is clear and readable, and conveys the life and eloquence which must have belonged to the original.

Negri accepts as genuine the letters to Iamblichus, discrediting for their sake the report of Eunapius that Iamblichus died before the end of Constantine's reign. But quite apart from the datum in Eunapius, it is impossible to think of Iamblichus as living when Julian was a Neoplatonist. It is his habit to refer to Iamblichus as if he were simply a literary source. In a note Negri consents, if the substantial genuineness is conceded, to suppose the letters as intended for another teacher, but wrongly addressed and interpolated by a copyist. If any motive could be seen for the harmless interpolations, the hypothesis would be acceptable. In view of the fact that the style, whether suggestive of Julian or not, is the style of a rhetorical school, it is safer to suppose that they are really letters to Iamblichus from an earlier pen than Julian's.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Life of St. Patrick and his Place in History.* By J. B. BURY.  
(London: Macmillan and Company; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1905. Pp. xv, 404.)

THERE are few historical figures about whom more diverse opinions have been held than about Saint Patrick. By some writers his existence has been denied altogether or explained away as Celtic mythology; by others his reputed labors have been divided among several men who bore the same name. One party has sought to limit and minimize the importance of his work, while another has stoutly defended his traditional position as the founder and organizer of Irish Christianity. Catholics and Protestants have found cause of controversy with regard to his relations to the Roman see. Much learning has been applied to the discussion of these questions, and a large body of information on the subject has been brought together by successive scholars. But a thorough analysis and comparison of the ultimate sources is a matter of very recent years, and in fact Professor Bury himself is the first scholar to attempt in any satisfactory fashion to account step by step for each of the Patrician documents and to show their relation one to another. In a series of essays contributed to the *English Historical Review* for 1902, *Hermathena* vol. XXVIII., the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* for 1903, and the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*

for the same year, he laid the foundation of his biography, and its completion has been facilitated by the Reverend N. J. D. White's critical editions of Patrick's *Confessio* and the *Letter to Coroticus*, and by the Reverend Professor Gwynn's diplomatic edition of the *Book of Armagh*.

The necessary limits of this review do not permit any extended recapitulation of Professor Bury's conclusions. His views with regard to the documents are conveniently summarized in his first appendix. With regard to Saint Patrick's much-disputed career, it is sufficient to say that the general result of the present study is to support the traditional view—what may be called the Roman Catholic view—of Patrick's work and of his relation to Rome. In the light of Professor Bury's analysis of the sources it is extremely difficult to defend a theory like that advanced by Professor Heinrich Zimmer in 1901 (*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, X. 204 *et seqq.*, translated by Miss A. Meyer, *The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland*, and published by Nutt, London, 1902), which holds Patrick to have been an unimportant and unsuccessful missionary in a limited field, and which would explain the usual account of his career as a fiction of the Romanizing party in Ireland in the seventh century. Professor Bury's attack upon this hypothesis must be regarded as successful. Whether the details of his own reconstruction of Patrick's biography will all stand a similarly searching criticism remains to be seen. He fully recognizes the problematic character of a large portion of it (see p. viii of his preface). But his method can without hesitation be said to be sound, and his mind singularly unbiassed. His mastery of the evidence, both in Latin and in Irish, is also unquestionable. In the interpretation of documents which are obviously in considerable part legendary, there is bound to be room for difference of opinion, even if complete agreement has been reached concerning the nature and mutual relations of the writings. Thus Professor Bury speaks on p. 82 of the "vain method of retaining as historical what is not miraculous". But it might be urged that he comes near practising this method himself on p. 158 when he preserves the moral meaning of a supernatural tale, though rejecting the truth of the narrative.

In addition to the central problems with which Professor Bury deals, his book contains many observations and suggestions of value to students both of church history and of early Celtic institutions. Special attention, by way of example, may be called to his remarks on the "Senchus Mór" (pp. 355-357), his characterization of the reign of King Loegaire (pp. 95 *et seqq.*, 353-355), and his suggestions with regard to the history of the Celtic tonsure (pp. 239 *et seqq.*).

In the general plan of the book, it appears from the preface (p. viii), Professor Bury has undertaken to exemplify his theory of historical narrative—to make "an effort in the art of historiography". The body of the work is cast in the form of a literary biography, and the narrative is burdened as little as possible with learned discussions. Critical and illustrative material is rigidly banished to the appendixes, which are

approximately equal in extent to the text. By this method the author is able to tell a straightforward story with very little digression or confusion. The style, too, though rather compact and severe, is lucid and readable.

F. N. ROBINSON.

*Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought.* By F. HOMES DUDDEN, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Two vols., pp. xvii, 476; 473.)

THE English have not been ungrateful to their apostle. It was they who first hailed him as a saint and gave his festival a place in their calendar. It was an English monk of Whitby who in the early seventh century wrote that first life of him which Paul Ewald has unearthed and Abbot Gasquet published. A greater Northumbrian scholar, Bede, insured his place in English history by the learning and the charm with which he recounted the great pope's part in the christianization of England; and the noblest of English kings not only gave this story to his people in their own tongue, but enriched their literature and their life with the teachings of Gregory himself. Even the religious revolt of the sixteenth century seems to have left their loyalty unshaken. The very sneer of Gibbon loses half its venom as he pictures the prelate whose vision took in far Britain; and in our own critical day, which has seen the revision of so many verdicts, English historians of the Middle Ages, from the Anglican Milman to the Quaker Hodgkin, have not less than their Catholic countrymen loved to linger over "Gregory, best and greatest in the long line of pontiffs".

Yet till now English scholarship has devoted to him no worthy monograph. A decade ago Mr. Hodgkin, in his brilliant chapter on the correspondence of Gregory, declared that for an adequate description two volumes like his own would not more than suffice. Whether or no this was the suggestion to Mr. Dudden of his task—and his debt to the Quaker historian is everywhere apparent—it is a work of precisely this bulk which he now gives us. The book is a monument of that patient scholarship we have learned to expect from the leisure of the English universities. It would not be easy to find in it anything new in conclusion or startling in arrangement. It shows neither the critical subtlety of Ewald nor the genial human insight of Hodgkin. But it rests everywhere sanely and safely on a personal study of the sources, guided and corrected by a wide knowledge of the researches of modern scholars.

Just how complete, indeed, is Mr. Dudden's acquaintance with the almost oppressive wealth of modern research in his field is matter for inference only. His preface, which discusses with care the original authorities, is content to name only the most directly pertinent of the recent literature; and in his foot-notes he has, "save in a very few cases, deliberately refrained, through considerations of space, from referring

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—42.

to modern authors". As this self-restriction suggests, Mr. Dudden's work, despite its scholarship and its bulk, is clearly meant not only to be studied but to be read. The polemics which he has excluded from his notes he has not admitted to his text; and with a keen eye for the picturesque and the entertaining he has woven into his narrative all that is most interesting in the story of sixth-century Europe. He frankly tells us, indeed, that his book "is intended, not merely as a biography of Gregory, but also in some degree as a work of reference on the Gregorian age".

The work falls into three main divisions. A book on "Gregory before His Pontificate" and a book on "Gregory's Pontificate" make up the biography proper. The third, of lesser bulk, is entitled "Gregory the Fourth Doctor of the Latin Church", and is devoted to Gregory's theology, redeeming the promise of the title as to "his place in thought". It is the first book, as will be guessed, which is most padded from the general history of the time. After an opening chapter on Gregory's family and home, a second, on the world of Gregory's childhood, invites a survey of the age of Justinian and a description of sixth-century Rome. One on Gregory's education—of which, in sooth, nothing is known except what may be inferred from the qualities and defects of his writings—is an essay on the schools of his time. A chapter on the coming of the Lombards gives place for the whole romantic story of that people; one on his stay as papal envoy at Constantinople, for a detailed picture of that metropolis of sixth-century civilization. Even thus helped out, the meagre particulars of Gregory's career, displayed on so vast a scale, take on somewhat the coarsened effect of an enlarged photograph. Yet Mr. Dudden is no unskilful narrator. His descriptions, especially, glow with life and color.

For Gregory as pope his materials are, of course, abundant. Following the traditional scheme, he treats him first as bishop of Rome, then as landlord of the papal estates and virtual regent of Italy, then as Patriarch of the West. The letters, for which he adopts implicitly the arrangement of Ewald and Hartmann, furnish, of course, the tissue of his story; but he cleverly extorts much evidence from Gregory's other works, notably from the *Dialogues*. His treatment of the latter offers perhaps the best measure of his discretion as a biographer. Eliminating the legend of Benedict and the doctrinal discussions at the end, he divides the remaining tales into three classes: stories of visions, stories of prophecies, and stories of miracles. The visions, though he relates several, he finds of little interest: "we may read the same things *ad nauseam* in all the lives of the saints." Of the prophecies the only two which can be tested prove to be nothing better than wrong guesses; hence "it is not unreasonable to suppose that the other tales of prophecies fulfilled were mostly legends which grew up after the events which are said to have been prophesied." The miracles he thinks of great interest to the student of the supernatural because at first sight they seem so well attested; but a closer look shows the evidence less good.

The age expected miracles; Gregory himself "had no capacity either for weighing and testing evidence brought forward by others or for drawing correct inferences from what fell within his personal observation"; and practically all the miracles which even Gregory will accept took place at a distance from Rome.

Mr. Dudden has, then, nothing of the temper of the professional hagiographer. His hero is a saint, indeed; but only a saintly man. He mentions the miraculous stories that gathered about his memory, but only to brush them aside as unworthy of credence. He makes him the creator of the medieval papacy, the shaper of the medieval church, the formulator of that popularized Augustinianism which from his day was western dogma. He lauds his "many splendid moral qualities"—his conscientious devotion to duty, his unfailing sympathy, his unswerving love of justice, his lavish generosity, his all-embracing charity, his unselfishness and self-forgetfulness even amid acute suffering of mind and body. But he makes him no moral prodigy. Even his conception of religion, he thinks, was somewhat hard and unlovely: "it lacked breadth and sunshine." His credulity, his irritability, his craft, his sycophancy, he explains, but he does not explain away: they may be condoned, but not justified. Yet, he justly adds, "in spite of his failings and many limitations, in spite of his typical Roman character, which tended to inspire more fear than love, the memory of Gregory will always be honoured throughout the Christian world." To that end Mr. Dudden's biography will nobly contribute.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*Theodore of Studium: His Life and Times.* By ALICE GARDNER,  
Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge.  
(London: Arnold. 1905. Pp. xiii, 284.)

MISS GARDNER presents her present volume as "a sketch of a notable man, who lived in notable times", as one in whose life "were focussed many great historical tendencies which gave their character to the Churches and the civil societies of the Middle Ages". It is perhaps owing to the fact that we have not, in English, a single biography in any degree adequate, nor a single edition of the works, of Theodore of Studium that there must be many, even among students, who know very imperfectly wherein lay his personal importance, apart from the historic interest of the time in which he lived. We think of him less as the Abbot of Saccudio and later of Studium, than as the opponent of Constantine VI. in his illegal union with Theodote (possibly a cousin, or even a sister of Theodore); as upholding the authority of the Church against the State in the matter of the election of the Patriarch, and of his consequent imprisonment; as exiled a second time for the same cause though for a different occasion, the proposed restoration to office of the priest who had performed the marriage of Constantine; and, above all, as upholding tradition in the great controversy with the Iconoclasts, and of his renewed exile and persecution.



All these things, and many more in which Theodore was concerned, are matters of history, but in addition to a review with all necessary detail of times which are perhaps as notable as any in the history of Christianity, we have here a biography of "a notable man" whose personal greatness has been somewhat overlooked in the overwhelming interest of the events, social, religious, and political, with which he was brought in contact.

It is an interesting point, however, in the appreciation of his character, that the greatness of the interests at stake were, for Theodore, an accident of the position. He was essentially a Puritan, a man who attributed grave moral importance to matters to which many, even among those nearest to him, were practically indifferent. The question of the Emperor's divorce, the cause of Theodore's first exile, was undoubtedly one in which he upheld domestic purity as against lawless despotism. That of the rehabilitation of the wretched priest, a mere political cat's-paw, a question for which Theodore again suffered, with equal willingness and equally for a question of principle, was, in the eyes of many, a mere petty personality not worth the discussion expended upon it. His opposition to the party of iconoclasm was again a matter purely of principle and in no sense of personal predilection. He was not a devotee of sacred art, he does not seem to have himself used icons as helps to devotion, he scoffs at the weakness of those who found them necessary, in his letters he constantly discourages all unauthorized flights of religious fancy, yet he exposed himself to suffering and possible death, refusing all compromise, for the sake of the doctrines which, in his eyes, seemed to stand or fall with the issue of the conflict. In the same way he was often blind, not only to the merits of his adversaries, but to the weaknesses of his allies; the cause alone occupied his mind. Nevertheless he was a leader of men, and his personal influence, even in exile, seems to have had an almost incredible force. Miss Gardner is at her best—as is natural in one of her training and associations—in vivid presentation of the history of the time, yet she never fails to perceive its psychological bearing upon the individuality of her subject. This careful balancing of the work of the historian and that of the biographer is a fair guaranty of the presentation of all sides of those questions of which the mere biographer might be tempted to give a one-sided or partial impression.

The author has used to the full all such original sources of information as remain to us, namely the two lives of Theodore: that of his contemporary Michael the Monk, and the longer and later one, based upon it but containing some additional matter, especially as to his early monastic career, which is now attributed to a certain John, or to Theodorus Daphnopates. In addition to these are the published works of Theodore, from which, especially from his letters, Miss Gardner quotes largely. The passages quoted have always illustrative value, and are the more welcome to the ordinary reader that, with the exception of a few hymns for which we are indebted to Dr. John Mason



Neale, we have nothing of Theodore's work in the English language. Migne has given us the only important, although incomplete, edition of his letters, addresses, and controversial epistles, since supplemented by Cozza-Luzzi; the present volume may suggest that an English edition would be of value to the church historian.

It is restful to turn from the stormy public career of Theodore to the contemplation of his quiet though somewhat interrupted retirement at Studium, and his work in hymnography and calligraphy. The chapter upon the problem of the ecclesiastical Greek scansion of his period, and the origin of tonic rhythm, with its struggle between quantity and accent, is especially interesting if only as showing how the combativeness of Theodore was exhibited even in questions purely literary.

The literary services of the Studium and its daughter communities as copyists of manuscripts may, we learn, have originated in the neat and businesslike handwriting which Theodore and Plato, his uncle and predecessor as abbot, may have acquired in youth in the government offices while still in the imperial service.

In a future edition the author will doubtless correct some errors and omissions in the index, and a few mistakes of fact and nomenclature pardonable in an author not personally acquainted with the Orient.

H. H. SPOER.

*The Political History of England.* Edited by WILLIAM HUNT, D.Litt., and REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A. In twelve volumes. Volume II. *The History of England from the Norman Conquest to the Death of John, 1066-1216.* By GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Professor of History in Yale University. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Pp. x, 473.)

PROFESSOR ADAMS'S volume is another mile-stone on the road which the scientific study of history has travelled during the past century. Although it is destined to render important services to students and to those who have neither the leisure nor the inclination to master the specialized and technical treatises upon which it rests, its greatest interest lies perhaps in the measure of progress and the forecast of future development which may be derived from it. The book contains little that is new, in the sense of not before having seen the light, and indeed the political history of England in the Middle Ages can offer little novelty when dealt with in isolation, even though the material be treated with the rigorously scientific method that Professor Adams has so consistently employed. One is driven to the conclusion that a fresh synthesis can be attained only by a reinterpretation of the authorities that shall rest upon a conception of the origins of English history very different from that which now holds the field. It is not a question of points of detail, nor even of the history of single institutions, but of the whole conception of the elements out of which, and the processes by which, English national consciousness and English self-government

developed. Primitive democracy, the predominance and sufficiency of the Teutonic element, and its unbroken evolution are the ideas in which most of us have been trained and by which our thinking is hampered or at least conditioned. And yet every year it is becoming more apparent that the system constructed upon these ideas requires, if not complete reconstruction, at least a very serious readjustment. Until this preliminary need is met and, as far as may be, satisfied, a reinterpretation of English history seems scarcely possible, and even a redigestion hardly to be a matter for reasonable hope. The most that can be done is to make a clear, conscientious statement of what knowledge we possess, a statement that shall gather up the results of the criticism and investigation of single questions, and try, by means of them, to dispel old illusions and to supply doctrine which at present seems nearer the truth. This is the line that Professor Adams has followed, and he has brought to his task of *vulgarisation* rich learning, sane judgment, and an objectivity so sensitively alert as to suggest that he is perpetually attended by the shade of an angry German methodologist.

The plan of the work, for which no doubt the editors are responsible, contributes by its chronological, its almost annalistic, disposition of the material to the general impression of the book which we have just now recorded. The analytical table of contents and the very adequate index make it easy and pleasant to use. The bibliographical arrangements, on the other hand, leave something to be desired, although, contrary to the unfortunate practice in books of this sort (notably in the *Cambridge Modern History*), a limited number of foot-notes have been permitted, and have in the present case been so wisely used as to make one wish that a much greater freedom had been granted. But the discussion of the original authorities and more important modern works (pp. 448-458) adds very little to the knowledge that is now generally available in Professor Gross's invaluable *Sources and Literature*, although there is a good note on Freeman (p. 456) and, in the remarks on Miss Norgate's *England under the Angevin Kings* and *John Lackland*, a touch of rich (if unconscious) humor combined with sound criticism that fully deserves quotation: "In the first book the influence of John Richard Green is clearly traceable both in the style and in the selection of facts for treatment. . . . The second book is a sober and careful study of John's career" (p. 457). But Professor Adams has excluded from his bibliography "the long list of monographs and special studies, English and foreign, which alone make possible the writing of a history of this age". One cannot help regretting that he had not referred his readers more often to Professor Gross's *Sources* and thus found space to include at least the contributions of this kind that have appeared since 1900.

Readers will be interested in Professor Adams's rather disparaging judgment of Henry II. (see particularly pp. 290-291, 351). He writes very much under the influence of Mr. Round, and in expressing the opinion that Henry's system was rather a development and expansion of

his grandfather's work than an original contribution he is really formulating the view toward which all of that great scholar's investigations have tended. The treatment of the thorny questions connected with the conquest of Ireland and the Bull *Laudabiliter* (pp. 263 *et seqq.*) is particularly sane and reasonable. In his judgment of the Great Charter, Professor Adams follows in the main the opinion of Professor Maitland, while repeating the views which he himself expressed in these pages six years ago.<sup>1</sup> Mr. McKechnie's laborious work (*Magna Carta*, Glasgow, 1905) and Mr. Jenks's vagaries (*Independent Review*, November, 1904, IV. 260-273) probably came too late to be used.

In a work so long and so full of detail some points naturally present themselves for criticism. In dealing with the anarchy in Stephen's reign, Professor Adams follows the view expressed by Mr. Round in *Geoffrey de Mandeville* (1892), but he does not discuss or even refer to the divergent opinion put forward by Mr. H. W. C. Davis (*English Historical Review*, October, 1903, XVIII. 630-641). We do not think that Mr. Davis made out his case, but his argument deserves attention. Again, the intrusion of William Cumin into the see of Durham is passed over in silence, although it seems to have been part of the general policy of the Empress and her uncle the King of Scots and as such to deserve mention. Professor Adams's description of the origin and nature of scutage is scarcely successful; the question is admittedly difficult and obscure, but one may fairly doubt whether a beginner would derive much light from the present statement of it (pp. 266 *et seqq.*). With regard to the claim of the Angevin kings in the twelfth century to be seneschals of France by reason of their tenure of the country of Anjou, Professor Adams seems to be following Bémont without giving any indication that the historical value of the treatise *De Senescalcia Franciae*, upon which this claim rests, has been very much discussed and by certain scholars entirely denied (p. 346). Great stress is laid on the influence which the ideas of chivalry, current in France in the twelfth century, exerted upon the conduct of Henry II. in general and in particular with regard to the coronation of the young Henry and the endowment of his other sons (pp. 302 *et seqq.*). Professor Adams even writes of "the courtly virtue of 'largesse,' which [Henry II.] followed with some restraint where money was concerned" (p. 304). Even a cursory examination of the *Pipe Roll of 1175-1176*, published in 1904, would have suggested that restraint was a more potent force in Henry's character than largess where money was concerned (cf. *English Historical Review*, July, 1905, pp. 558-560). John's marriage with Isabella of Angoulême is described as "a blunder in morals, in which, . . . by an act of passion and perfidy, he gave his antagonist a better excuse than he could have hoped for when he was at last ready to renew the war" (p. 397). We have no desire to defend the morals of John, but we wish that Professor Adams had taken account of Miss

<sup>1</sup>"The Critical Period of English Constitutional History," *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, V. 643-658.

Norgate's suggestion that the marriage had been originally proposed by Philip and was carried out by John as part of a considered policy connected with the internal conditions of Poitou, with the "deliberate purpose of goading [the Lusignans] into some outrageous course of action which might enable him to recover La Marche and ruin them completely" (*John Lackland*, 75-77). Professor Adams writes, "the Gréat Charter was drawn up and sealed on June 15, 1215" (p. 437). The point is discussed by Mr. McKechnie (*Magna Carta*, 48-49), who makes out a strong case for the view that several days were consumed in negotiation, so that the charter did not pass the seal until June 19; and even if Mr. McKechnie's book came too late to be used, this point had already been raised by Blackstone.

The statement that Matilda was crowned "Queen of Germany" (p. 155), and the description of John's second primate as "Stephen of Langton" (p. 409), are surely slips. Misprints are uncommon, indeed we have noticed only three (pp. 244, 372, 377). The rendering of *legalis homo* by "legal man" strikes one as both awkward and misleading.

It must be confessed that the whole book is without literary grace or adornment, but serious and even pedestrian as the style is, it is neither dry nor repellent. Still occasional lapses occur, and we cannot pass without a protest such a sentence as this: "Coming to the door of the church, he knelt and prayed; at the spot where Thomas fell, he wept and kissed it" (p. 310). Examples of the same sort of thing may be found on pp. 263, 308, 358, 410.

We have dealt much in criticism, but it would be unjust at once to the excellence of Professor Adams's work and to our own sense of its value to conclude without a word of appreciation of the service which he has rendered to students of English history, whether they be beginners or teachers. His book is informed with a large-minded, conscientious desire to see the past as it actually was and to represent it truthfully to men of his own day.

GAILLARD THOMAS LAPSLEY.

*Forum Turolii, Regnante in Aragonia Adefonso Rege, anno Domini Nativitatis mclxxvi.* Transcripción y estudio preliminar de FRANCISCO AZNAR Y NAVARRO. (Zaragoza: Cecilio Gasca. 1905. Pp. xlv, 300.)

THE series of which this is the second volume—the *Colección de Documentos para el Estudio de la Historia de Aragón*—gives promise of affording valuable assistance to the student of the medieval period, not only in Spain but in general. The first volume, issued in 1904 by Don Eduardo Ibarra y Rodríguez (see this REVIEW, X. 915), contained an interesting collection of *Documentos correspondientes al Reinado de Ramiro I. desde 1034 hasta 1063 años*, and the present one is even more valuable.

Alfonso II. of Aragon in 1171 advanced the border of the Reconquest to Teruel, and in 1176 he granted to the new settlers this Fuero or Customary. It is exceedingly complete and elaborate, consisting of 552 articles, comprising all the details of civic life coming within the scope of the lawgiver, and consequently it presents us with an unrivalled review of medieval habits and customs. Of course such a body of laws could not be evolved from the inner consciousness of the sovereign, and this is a development from the anterior Fuero of Daroca. It continued for ages to satisfy the needs of the community, for it was sworn to, in 1547, by decree of Prince Philip, acting for his father Charles V. In 1564 it was revised in some respects, to accommodate it to the autocratic principles of Philip, then king. After the Córtes of Tarazona, in 1592, when the troubles occasioned by Antonio Pérez enabled Philip to make a breach in the liberties of Aragon, he abrogated the Fuero of Teruel, in 1597, by a transparent fiction, in which the people were represented as asking for this change and were forced to pay him 122,000 libras for the privilege of subjecting themselves to the laws of Aragon. Not only did it thus prove itself as adapted to the needs of Teruel and its district, extending over some twelve hundred square miles, but it was the source of much of the local legislation of Castile. The Fuero of Cuenca was based upon it, and thence it was transplanted to Sepúlveda, where it served as a model for various other places. Its importance as a medieval document can thus be understood, and the merit of rendering it accessible to students can be appreciated.

Of the three hundred pages which it occupies there is scarcely one which does not afford insight into the manners and modes of thought of the period, showing that society was by no means so simple and rude as we are apt to imagine. When we read (p. 133) of a fine of ten sueldos for casting water from a window, or spitting upon one in the street, we recognize a refinement greater than that existing, five hundred years later, in Madrid or Edinburgh; and a similar early solicitude for cleanliness and health is seen in the provision (p. 49) that whoever dirties the street shall cleanse it and pay five sueldos.

There is conspicuous proof of the toleration prevailing throughout Spain during the earlier Middle Ages in the law (p. 16) providing that homicide committed by a Jew on a Christian, or by a Christian on a Jew, is to be treated like homicide between Christians. The *Maurus pacis*—the Mudéjar, or Moor domiciled among Christians—was treated, however, somewhat less equitably (p. 17). The Christian, indeed, who wounded or slew a Moor paid for him the same *wergild* as for a Christian. So the Moor wounding a Christian also paid the same as a Christian, but, if the Christian died, the Moor was delivered to the kindred, to extort the *wergild* and then do with him as they pleased. The difference is probably attributable, not to religious discrimination, but to the fact that the Moor was more sudden and quick in quarrel than the Jew, and therefore was regarded as requiring sharper restraint. In an age of class privilege it reflects the stubborn assertiveness of Aragonese

freemen that a noble or knight, committing violence of any kind in the district of Teruel, could be slain without incurring the penalties of homicide (p. 14).

The primitive methods of proving innocence of course were in vogue. Compurgation with six or twelve compurgators was used, but mostly for churchmen. For women the red-hot iron ordeal was sometimes employed (p. 209). Among laymen the usual solvent, in both civil and criminal matters, was the wager of battle, which was conducted under very peculiar regulations. If there were several defendants, one was chosen by lot, and he could elect whether to fight on horseback or on foot. The appellant apparently never fought personally, but by a champion, who was not to be a mercenary or one who had previously served in that capacity in Teruel. If the combat was to be on horseback, the appellant had three terms of nine days, in each of which to produce five cavaliers; the judge measured them carefully, with leather thongs, to find one of perfect equality with the defendant, and, if none such were found, the latter's oath to his innocence or his rights was accepted; but if one were smaller, the defendant could agree to fight with him. If the combat was on foot, the same preliminaries were observed, except that among the disabilities of the champion was that of being a farrier. The antagonists wore complete armor; the cavaliers had a blunted lance, a shield, and two swords; the footmen the same, except that only one sword was allowed. When the equal champion was found, the two watched their arms that night in the church and heard mass in the morning, after which the defendant swore that he was defending the truth and the champion that he swore falsely. They were then conducted to the field, where the judge laid out the boundaries, the crossing of which by either party was equivalent to defeat. The combat lasted until sunset and might be prolonged for three days, during which the combatants ate and slept together in the house of the judge, who kept them strictly from converse with any one—whoever attempted to speak with them, either there or in the lists, was fined sixty sueldos. Each morning the judge and alcaides replaced them in the field with precisely the same arms that they had had the previous evening. At any time the two combatants could come to terms, unless the fight was for homicide or theft, in which case the consent of the crown was necessary, as it had a share in the *wergild*. If the defendant was worsted, in a case of debt or false-witness, he paid double, and the appellant could hold him until he paid; if for crime in which the crown had an interest, the judge held him until he paid or gave security. The champion, if victorious, received forty sueldos; if beaten, ten sueldos; if he was killed, his widow or children were entitled to twenty. If he came to terms with the defendant after they were armed in the field, he was paid five, increased to ten after the combat had commenced (pp. 107-114).

Did space permit, it would be easy to multiply illustrations of the interesting details of which the Fuero is full, but these will suffice to indicate how much is to be gathered from a code so extensive and so

minute. The introduction of the learned editor is devoted to an exhaustive vindication of the antiquity and authority of the *Fuero*, which leaves nothing to be desired except that he might have facilitated reference by a simple table of the rubrics of the several articles, and that a glossary of the words, for which the student may vainly search his Ducange, would have relieved the obscurity of some passages, for those not so familiar as himself with the medieval lore of Aragon.

HENRY CHARLES LEA.

*John of Gaunt.* By SYDNEY ARMITAGE-SMITH. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Archibald Constable and Company, Ltd., 1905 [1904]. Pp. xxviii, 490.)

IF we may trust the silence of the *Catalogue of the British Museum*, the present work is the first attempt at an extended biography of the Duke of Lancaster. Moreover, the difficulties of the subject being such as they are, the author is destined in all probability to hold this field for many years to come. It is of interest, therefore, to know that he regards John of Gaunt with somewhat more favor than the historian ordinarily who treats of this period of English history. He denies that John of Gaunt ever directed his ambition toward the English crown, but holds that his mind was always and at all times set on "continental sovereignty".

In support of his thesis, the author has brought to bear a knowledge of source-material which other workers may well envy. His results, moreover, in the main seem sound. We may fully admit that sufficient importance has not been given to the influence of the Spanish Marriage in shaping the policy of John of Gaunt's later life. The attempt, however, to reverse the accepted view of the duke's relations to English parties at home, and particularly to relieve him of all responsibility for the conditions that disgraced the last years of his father's reign, is not so satisfactory.

The author frankly admits that he finds no support for his view in the *Chronicle of St. Albans*. Now the *Chronicle of St. Albans* presents the only full account that we have of the last years of Edward III. It is, furthermore, unquestionably the work of a contemporary who was in close touch with some of the men who were trying to wrest the government from the corrupt ring who controlled its patronage. The author, however, claims that the chronicler is superstitiously credulous in the matter of dreams and portents and bitterly hostile to John of Gaunt, and that therefore he is "wholly untrustworthy" (p. 134), and his testimony is to be rejected altogether. Is this verdict sound? Adam of Usk, the "hard-headed lawyer and impartial critic" as Mr. Armitage-Smith styles him (p. xxvi), is guilty of folly quite as grave in his pedigree of the Mortimers as the dream of de la Hoo. Warkworth's *Womere waters* and *blazing comets* tax our patience quite as seriously. In fact, if we accept this canon of the author, we shall be forced to rule



out most of the favorite sources of English history from Baeda down to the *Annual Register*.

The hostility of the chronicler is a far more serious charge. His testimony is undoubtedly that of an enemy. But does an enemy never tell the truth? Mr. Armitage-Smith admits that the *Chronicle* reflects contemporary popular feeling toward the duke. Is there not then a core of facts to be discovered even in such testimony, to be carefully distinguished from the opinions of the writer, facts which in popular estimation justified the prevailing hostility and which the modern historian must not ignore in making his estimate of the life and character of John of Gaunt?

But even if the author be allowed to throw out of court in this summary fashion the chief witness for the prosecution, the question may still be fairly asked, Does he upon the evidence submitted free John of Gaunt from all responsibility for the presence of the unclean herd that befouled the court of Edward III.? To say that John of Gaunt did not appoint these ministers is hardly to the point, since the appointment of ministers was a function of the crown. It is scarcely nearer the mark to claim that because John of Gaunt was absent on the continent during much of the time when the corrupt lay ministry was in power, *i. e.*, from 1371 to 1376, he must have been a cipher in politics at home, without knowledge of the inner history of the council and hence without responsibility.

Now as a matter of fact during most of this period John of Gaunt was in England and not on the continent. In January, 1371, upon the retirement of the Black Prince, he had succeeded to the command in Aquitaine. But in December he followed the prince to England and remained at home until July, 1373. The author admits this, but gives us to understand that during these eighteen months there was little doing at home, that the year 1372 passed without a Parliament, and hence there was little opportunity for Lancaster to make his presence felt. Now there was not only a Parliament in 1372 but a very important one (*Rot. Parl.* 46 Edward III.). These months, moreover, were months of great activity on the part of the government. Enormous sums were raised for the war with France, and three separate expeditions, one led by John of Gaunt himself, were sent out from England in the vain hope of saving Aquitaine. In April, 1374, Lancaster returned home, not to leave England again until after the death of the king, save for two trips to Flanders, in both of which he was entrusted with diplomatic missions of the greatest importance.

John of Gaunt, therefore, could hardly have been ignorant of the character of the people who surrounded his father. Moreover, his own prominence in public service, his necessarily close connection with the men who were to finance his expeditions, force us to believe that if he did not actually support the ministers in their evil doings, he at least connived at their misdeeds. It is true that when the day of reckoning came, Lancaster made no effort to shield his father's ministers from



the wrath of the "Good Parliament". But it must be borne in mind that the leader of the reform movement was the Black Prince himself, who had risen from his sick-bed to purge his father's court, and that John of Gaunt feared his popular brother. When, however, six months later the Black Prince was dead, Lancaster broke his silence not to carry on his brother's work but to undo it, and to turn with marked vindictiveness upon the men who had been prominent in the support of the Black Prince. The author's explanation of this later conduct of the duke is ingenious but hardly convincing.

In his efforts to make out his case, the author has not forgotten the friendships of Lancaster, which it is claimed are inconsistent with the accepted view of his character. The use of Chaucer's name is unfortunate. Even waiving the question of the relationship of Philippa Chaucer and Catharine Swynford, the man who could thus lament the fall of Pedro the Cruel, the passing favorite of the English court—

"O noble, O worthy Pedro, glory of Spain,  
Whom fortune held so high in majesty,"—

proves himself too much of a courtier to be other than blind to the serious faults of his patron (pp. 64-65). Of Wyclif's high mind and single heart, however, there can be no question. Yet the alliance of the two can hardly be cited as a voucher for the character of the duke, any more than the later Pitt-Newcastle alliance may be cited to prove that history has been in error in the verdict which she has passed upon Newcastle and his methods. A common cause makes strange bedfellows sometimes. That John of Gaunt ever comprehended the logical significance of Wyclif's teachings, or that he delighted in the character of the high-souled doctor, or that he supported him beyond the point where Wyclif ceased to be useful in plucking the fine feathers of the churchmen, does not appear.

Of minor matters it may be worth while to note that the title *El Justiciero* (the doer of justice) applied to Pedro (p. 65), so strangely out of keeping with all that we know of this Dahomey chief of the fourteenth century, was not conferred upon him until the days of the autocratic Ferdinand, when no one might speak ill of any king of Castile.

In describing the battle of "L'Espagnols sur Mer" (pp. 6-8), while claiming to follow Froissart, the author calls *La Salle du Roi* the flag-ship. The name of the king's ship is not given by Froissart. Moreover, the flag-ship could not have been *La Salle du Roi*, since the king is described by Froissart as passing by this ship in the course of the action. In describing the gay scene on board the king's ship on the eve of the battle, the author is evidently thinking of Drake on the historic Devonshire green, rather than the Edward of Froissart.

On p. 21—evidently an error of the proof-reader—1369 is given as the date of the death of John of Gaunt. It was the Duchess Blanche rather who died in 1369. Again, p. 10, the comment on the death of the

false queen of Edward II. hardly does justice to the fact that she had been kept a prisoner for twenty-eight years. The statement that Prince Edward received his famous christening at Crecy, a statement that has the support of no contemporary authority, ought not to be made without some qualification.

Besides the more obvious and accessible facts of John of Gaunt's career, to be noticed as of special value is the chapter upon the Lancastrian estates, in which, aided by a map which has evidently cost much labor, the author brings out quite clearly the many ramifications of the Lancastrian lands and their importance as a basis of Lancastrian political influence. So also may be noted the fact that the Beaufort from which the illegitimate family of Lancaster took its name was the Beaufort of Champagne and not of Anjou as commonly given. The full apology of Northumberland for his brutal insult to Lancaster in 1381, which Mr. Armitage-Smith has drawn from the unpublished Register of the Duchy of Lancaster, is here brought out for the first time; so also the important fact, which even Bishop Stubbs missed, that Michael de la Pole was the friend of Lancaster and not his enemy. The attempt, however, to clear up the strange charge brought against Lancaster in 1384 by the Carmelite friar, as the result of a vicious trick on the part of Oxford to destroy Lancaster, is hardly satisfactory. It is more reasonable to believe with the Monk of Evesham that the poor friar was the victim of his own hallucinations.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

*England under the Tudors.* By ARTHUR D. INNES. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Methuen and Company. 1905. Pp. xix, 481.)

THIS is the fourth in chronological order and the second in date of publication of the six volumes which comprise Professor Oman's collaborate history of England. It is, as far as the present reviewer is aware, the first single volume to treat of the Tudor period as a whole. Its author has already put forth one book on a subject lying within the present field, and two others dealing with a later one.

It is obvious at a glance that the present work possesses a number of admirable qualities. In the first place the proportions are excellent. Of the 427 pages which compose the main part of the book, 58 are devoted to Henry VII., 128 to Henry VIII., 30 to Edward VI., 26 to Mary, and 185 to Elizabeth. It is totally free from theological bias; it is eminently fair-minded and just in its conception of the important characters of the period: the treatment of the reign of Mary is in this respect particularly admirable. It is a most useful volume for purposes of reference; it is easy to find facts in it; it is furnished with an excellent index and useful genealogical tables, maps, and appendixes on special topics.

A closer examination however reveals a wide discrepancy in knowledge, treatment, and expression between the first part of the book and the second. Certainly Mr. Innes is not seen at his best in his chapters

on Henry VII. and Henry VIII. A number of minor errors and inaccuracies reveal his inadequate acquaintance with the recent literature of this period; and his style, in the first part of his book, lacks precision and definiteness. But the gravest defect of all is the author's ignorance of continental affairs from 1485 to the accession of Elizabeth. This is indeed a serious charge to bring against any historian of the Tudors, whose most permanent service to England lay in their dealings with outside powers; but it is impossible to acquit Mr. Innes. Mistakes of date, of which there are many (e.g., "Lewis XI. died in 1482", p. 13; "the accession of Lewis XII. in 1497", p. 36), may be forgiven; ignorance of the fact that Milan belonged to the Hapsburgs in 1559 (indicated by the second map at the end of the book) is more serious; but worst of all is the frequent recurrence of loose and inaccurate sentences, which leave the reader the unwelcome choice between positive error of the grossest kind, and absolute meaninglessness. As an example of this type of sentence may be cited the words in which the author describes the internal state of France in 1485: "With the exception of the Dukedom of Brittany, which still claimed a degree of independence, and of Flanders and Artois which, though fiefs of France, were still ruled by the House of Burgundy, the whole country was under the royal dominion" (p. 13). Mr. Innes is much too fond of this dangerous and misleading word "dominion". Or again, if instead of remarking "that whenever Charles had a wife living he appears to have been faithful to her" (foot-note to p. 183), Mr. Innes had taken the trouble to find out just how many times the Emperor was married, and had stated the fact clearly and distinctly, before commenting on Charles's "divagations . . . in the intervals", one cannot help feeling that the force of his compliment would have been increased.

But when Mr. Innes reaches the reign of Elizabeth, these defects, for the most part, disappear. Minor errors are but few, the style improves: when the author is at his best he is by no means lacking in ability to express himself, and he seems to gain confidence and power as he progresses, like the English nation whose development he describes. His grasp of continental affairs in the Elizabethan period, moreover, contrasts pleasantly with his earlier shortcomings in this respect. The fact that he has Professor Seeley's *Growth of British Policy* to guide him after 1558 is perhaps partially accountable for this welcome change. And we hasten to add that this latter part of his work is more than a careful and readable summary of a glorious reign: it contains several special features of peculiar and distinguishing value, for example, the excellent and much-needed account of Shan O'Neill in chapter xx., and the brief yet thorough estimate of Elizabethan literature. For all the latter part of his work Mr. Innes is certainly deserving of high praise; we only wish, for the sake of the reputation of the book as a whole, that the earlier pages were more nearly like it.

ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN.

*Henry VIII.* By A. F. POLLARD. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. 1p. xii, 470.)

THIS book is a new edition, revised, enlarged, and carefully annotated, of the sumptuous biography of Henry VIII. by the same author, published in 1902 by Messrs. Goupil and Company. There can be no doubt that the present compact volume will prove far more useful for purposes of historical study than its bulkier and far more expensive predecessor, which, though copiously illustrated and beautifully printed and bound, was totally lacking in foot-notes, index, and bibliographical references. Certainly Mr. Pollard has never produced a more scholarly and serviceable book than this. He has used to the fullest advantage the monumental collection of *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, which is now nearing its completion, and yet on the other hand he has by no means neglected secondary authorities; he has an enviable background of general historical knowledge; his judgments are for the most part sane and consistent; and he writes clearly and convincingly. Occasionally he is led to use a phrase or title which may be regarded as out of place in a serious historical work; as, for example, when he labels the chapter dealing with the crucial events of 1533-1534 "The Prevailing of the Gates of Hell", but in general his style is such as to add force and picturesqueness to his narrative. As far as the present reviewer is able to discover, the volume is entirely free from misprints and minor errors.

There are a number of debatable points in the reign of Henry VIII., on which every student of history has a right to his own opinion; and Mr. Pollard's views on some of these will doubtless elicit criticism and perhaps contradiction from other laborers in the Tudor vineyard. He has already crossed swords with Dr. Gairdner on the very difficult subject of the character of the king himself. Dr. Gairdner maintains that the simplest explanation of Henry's extraordinary career is "that it was due to selfishness combined with a wonderful deal of diplomatic cunning", while Mr. Pollard asserts that the desire to see England great and prosperous had a large share in determining the king's action at every great crisis of the reign, that Henry shaped his personal ends so that they coincided with what was best for the nation as a whole. That the two foremost authorities on the Tudor period can disagree on a point as fundamental as this is a significant and perhaps not entirely discouraging fact for younger students of sixteenth-century history to reflect upon. Another even more important point on which Mr. Pollard's views will doubtless arouse contention is the very delicate question of Henry's relations with his Parliaments, especially the great Reformation Parliament of 1529-1536. Was the famous assembly which passed the acts that severed England from Rome packed and intimidated, or free? Mr. Pollard sturdily maintains the latter view; asserts that there is "nothing to show that Henry VIII. intimidated his Commons at any time, or that he packed the Parliament of 1529"; and,

be it added, materially strengthens his case by a skilful anticipation and refutation of the arguments of those who disagree with him. All that Mr. Pollard says in this matter must be treated with respect and will doubtless dispose of a good many of the extremer statements of those who disagree with him; yet on the other hand there can be little doubt that he sometimes overstates his own case. If, for example, freedom of speech and freedom from arrest for members of Parliament were "established" in 1512 and 1543 (p. 259), why was Peter Wentworth thrice imprisoned in the reign of Elizabeth?

ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN.

*Renaissance Portraits.* By PAUL VAN DYKE, D.D., Professor in History, Princeton University. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. xiii, 425.)

THERE are portraits of all sorts and sizes, from miniatures by Sidney Cooper to equestrian figures of Philip IV. in the best manner of Velasquez. Dr. Van Dyke's studies of Aretino, Thomas Cromwell, and Maximilian I. are essays in criticism rather than biographical condensations and so belong to the domain of art. The author writes, as he tells us in a choice humanistic epigram, for the love of scholarship and to beguile the leisure of his friends. Such a phrase may to some minds suggest the sketches of an amateur and not the studied efforts of a professional. The present volume, however, is far from amateurish in either preparation or manner. We began by making an allusion to the scale of the performance. These three bits of historical delineation are more than miniatures and less than the heroic canvases of a conventional biographer. Without attempting to carry further the figure which is suggested by the title, each of the three papers here published is equivalent to a long article in an English quarterly, besides possessing other qualities which recall well-known papers in the *Edinburgh Review*.

Of all great epochs the Renaissance demands from its historian the widest sympathy and the keenest discrimination. We would, at least, by some unqualified statement emphasize the variegated character of Quattrocento and Cinquecento, the element of paradox which enters into the career of every political or intellectual leader then living, the incredible freaks of psychology that tempt one to heighten his colors or darken his shadows. In each case, Dr. Van Dyke has selected a sharply articulated type. Aretino, Cromwell, and Maximilian were men whom it is very easy to caricature or to denounce. All had striking talents, and to these Cromwell added extraordinary force of will. Yet for a variety of reasons not one of the three evokes anything like genuine admiration from the modern world. Dr. Van Dyke has certainly made an interesting choice of figures, and he seldom strays far from his main purpose, which is neither to extol nor to extenuate, but to interpret.

Aretino, whether on intimate acquaintance he be liked or not, is worth understanding. We once heard a professor of history who should have known better speak about him as though he were a Celtic decadent

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI. —43.

with a taste for absinthie. A glance at any one of his portraits by Titian should dispel this idea, but Dr. Van Dyke has ample scope for effort in clearing away both vulgar errors and deeply rooted misapprehensions. A blackmailer and a writer of pornographic literature he remains after all the facts have been laid bare, but the talents by which he recommended himself to the service of the great and which admitted him on even terms to excellent society deserve the reward of an impartial disclosure. Were it possible that such a type should appear to-day in London or New York, few of the intellectuals who could avoid doing so would come near him. Indeed, when full allowance has been made for the generous eclecticism of the Renaissance, it is difficult to realize that he should have been the friend of decent people—a phenomenon to be explained partly by the paradoxes of the age, partly by fear of having a foul-mouthed enemy, and partly by a general willingness on the part of mankind to accept friendship when it is proffered. Dr. Van Dyke gives us full means of estimating Aretino's peculiar gifts and does him the justice of letting him reveal himself. But one must continue to cherish a fondness for the story of how Tintoretto one day measured his stature in terms of pistol lengths, by way of giving him a useful hint.

We hurry past the essay on Maximilian (in whose character Dr. Van Dyke finds the thirst for distinction and family pride to be more powerful passions than a love of art) in order that we may glance at the paper on Thomas Cromwell. As readers of this REVIEW are already aware, Dr. Van Dyke has strong views regarding Cardinal Pole's *Apologia ad Carolum Quintum*, a work which is responsible for much of the prejudice at present felt against the despoiler of the monasteries. To follow up Pole's special pleading is one thing; to secure a proper basis for estimating Cromwell's character is another. It is in the seven thousand letters which he wrote or which were written to him or which were written about him that Dr. Van Dyke finds the positive materials for his essay. According to this latest verdict, Cromwell, judged for what he was, seems "morally neither better nor worse than the average man of his age; if we judge him by what he did, it seems difficult to deny him a place among the most capable statesmen of all ages" (p. 258).

We regret that dearth of space prevents us from giving by citation some favor of Dr. Van Dyke's style or from touching upon a few of the moot points which fall within his essays. These papers belong to a delightful class of historical writing and illustrate the opportunities it affords to those who combine ideas with scholarship. The few slips we have noticed are of no great moment. As an example, Gloucestershire would need to be expanded considerably before it could take in ninety monasteries with an average of sixty-five thousand acres apiece (p. 209).

*Deutsche Geschichte*. Der ganzen Reihe siebenter Band. Erste Hälfte. Von KARL LAMPRECHT. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag von Hermann Heyfelder. 1905. Pp. xv, 396.)

WITH the publication, last year, of his *Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft* (see this REVIEW, XI. 119-121) Professor Lamprecht seems to have given more or less final shape to the exposition of his historical method. The first six volumes of the *Deutsche Geschichte* were put forth with very little of apology or explanation, and it was only slowly that the consciousness of historical scholars was aroused to the fact that the work was little less than revolutionary in purpose and method. By the year 1895, however, there had arisen such a storm of debate that the author was forced to take up the cudgels in his own defense. The decade following that year is destined to rank as the period of the Lamprecht controversy, and the end is not yet. In these years the regular course of publication of the volumes was interrupted while the author was engaged in the defense of his attitude as a writer of history and in the preparation of his *Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit*. He returns in the present half-volume to the point where the work was suspended ten years ago, and, when the second half of the seventh volume is published, will have brought his history down to the period just prior to the French Revolution, the point at which, according to his scheme, the period of individualism merges into that of subjectivism.

In general the present volume adheres, in both plan and method, to the design upon which the earlier volumes were constructed. If one is conscious of any change, it lies in a stronger accentuation of the distinctively psychological attitude toward the facts of history. The period covered, although Lamprecht resolutely refuses to be tied down within rigid date-boundaries, is approximately that between the sixteenth and the middle of the eighteenth century. "History", says the author, "is primarily a socio-psychological science." His whole history therefore is not strictly a *Kulturgeschichte* but rather a *Seelengeschichte* of the German nation, and this volume is wholly devoted to the intellectual and psychic life of the period covered. The second half of the volume, when published, is expected to trace the political history during the same period. Books nineteen and twenty of the general work are included here. Book nineteen is devoted to the intellectual movements and the *Weltanschauung* of the time. First comes an analysis of the foreign influences on German culture, particularly the Italian and the French. Then follows a discussion of the new ideals of cosmopolitan culture which, finding their earliest acceptance among the princes and court circles, gradually spread downward through the ranks of society. In the field of purely intellectual development the chief interest centres in the growth of rationalism through the influence of the natural sciences, metaphysics, and education. The leading phenomena in the psychic life of the period are found to be the so-called enlightenment movement and Pietism, the discussion of which



leads one into the rather dreary region of post-Reformation religious thought. Book twenty is concerned with the fine arts and literature. The chapter subjects are: The Rococo and Baroco Styles of Art, The Poetry of the Renaissance, Music and Poetry, Further Musical and Literary Changes. One looks in vain for any systematic treatment of these subjects as independent facts. To Lamprecht they have interest and find a place only as they help to interpret the soul-life of the nation.

The character of the period covered is such as to offer an excellent field for the sort of historical interpretation which Lamprecht believes to be the only scientific one. If the historian is to find his true work not in the correlated grouping of events but in a study of the "psychic mechanism of the periods of culture", clearly that period which marked the transition from the life that was essentially medieval to that which is distinctively modern offers unusual attractions. Among the following which Lamprecht has secured the word has gone out that the revolution in historical method is already a *fait accompli*, and indeed the Lamprecht idea seems, for the time being, to have triumphed in Germany. The Rankian method, always narrative in form and sometimes frankly didactic in purpose, is to be supplanted by the analytical historical essay. But it may well be questioned whether the present movement is not merely an exaggerated but necessary protest against the neglect of the social-psychic element in historical interpretation. Like much of the current sociological writing, to which it is closely akin, it is a brilliant intellectual feat which is singularly unfruitful in independent results. History is not likely to be dissolved into folk-psychology and historical sociology.

ULYSSES GRANT WEATHERLY.

*The England and Holland of the Pilgrims.* By the late HENRY MARTYN DEXTER, D.D., LL.D., and his son MORTON DEXTER. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1905. Pp. xiii, 673.)

UNTIL the middle of the nineteenth century no living person knew from what point in England the Independents, harried out of their home land, had fled, in order to reach Holland, where they knew conscience was free. Mr. James Savage, editor of the *Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New England*, received from the Reverend Joseph Hunter of Yorkshire a hint that the "Ansterfield" of defective New England printing was the mask for "Austerfield", and to this Englishman belongs the first honors of fruitful investigation. After Hunter had discovered the baptismal record of the baby William, afterward Governor Bradford, and, as we may say, the first American historian, his little book of 1849 told of *The Founders of New Plymouth*. Even before this, however, N. C. Kist, the Leyden professor, and Dr. J. G. de H. Scheffer, the Mennonite scholar of Amsterdam, had already delved in the Dutch archives, bringing forth rich data concerning these English exiles for conscience sake.



Such pioneers having struck the vein of ore, Dr. H. M. Dexter, with the enthusiasm of a born antiquarian though hardly with the gifts of a philosophic historian, made eight visits to Scrooby. Spending also his time and money freely in both Holland and England, he recovered to history many names and incidents. With the aid of his unrivalled collection of original documents, which had survived the fire, and other destructive agencies of political churchmen, he gave the world a bulky volume entitled *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, as Seen in its Literature* (New York, 1880). He treated especially of the careers of Robert Browne and John Robinson, and of the inner history of the English Separatist churches in Amsterdam and Leyden. Those who know this earlier book will recognize in the work under review the same hand, the same opinions, and the same general conspectus. To many the view will seem unjustifiably narrow, though it is very pleasant to notice that the matters formerly dealt with more or less fully by Dr. H. M. Dexter are here treated by his son independently, though with few essential changes of opinion. The son's canon of orthodoxy, as editor and rewriter of his father's manuscript, is that of Dr. Benjamin Jowett, the translator of Thucydides, who has declared that "we must interpret an ancient writer by himself, and by his own age and not by modern notions". This is all true, but one would have gladly welcomed a treatment of Pilgrim history less limited, by the predestination of filial piety, to the very narrow view of American origins which prevails among so many men brought up only in New England. One would almost imagine from this book that these seventeenth-century Englishmen, so sensitive to currents of life and thought in their home land, had suddenly become and remained impervious to influences that were active in the nascent federation beyond the North Sea wherein modern religious liberty had some of its beginnings. The title thunders, while the text whispers of Holland. To the filial editor the League of Seven States might as well be, what on the sign-boards of country English inns it is—"The Leg and Seven Stars". One is often reminded, as he reads these pages, of the bald and colorless methods of the annalist; or even of the political envoy sent abroad who fears that his enemies will be in power on his return home. Nevertheless, this may be the best way of furnishing the facts from which the true historian is to deduce the final story. Yet one can hardly accept the opening chapter of book 1., "The England of Our Fathers", as anything like a full or satisfactory picture, because the economic conditions, which had so much to do with the movement of Englishmen to the Netherlands, are practically unnoticed, while of the Netherlands there is no general description. We have, instead, only a slight, untinted picture of Leyden, the city in which the first founders of New England, in overwhelming majority, spent the most sensitive, as it was the formative, period of their lives.

The book is strongest on the side of opinion, theology, and controversial literature. Its six books contain an enormous mass of trust-

worthy information, while in the five appendixes we have the personalia dealt with so liberally and with such accuracy that one must feel very grateful to the unwearied labors of the three Dexters (Henry, Franklin, and Morton Dexter), continued during a period of over half a century. The two indexes are of publications and of general subjects, and the foot-notes are copious. The original documents are set forth in their own spelling, and the illustrations are only what the rigid critic needs. Altogether, after noting the limitations, hereditary and contemporaneous, of this work, every scholar must be thankful for the goodly volume, which grandly concludes with a paragraph (p. 595) revealing both severe conscience and superb catholicity. The author scouts the idea of "the Pilgrim Colony in America . . . as merely ecclesiastical in origin or development". On the contrary, "It was one of the earliest manifestations of that resistless impulse of expansion and conquest which asserted itself in the England of that period, and even earlier in Spain, and which changed the whole face of the globe."

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

*Les Nouvellistes.* Par FRANTZ FUNCK-BRENTANO, avec la collaboration de M. PAUL D'ESTRÉE. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1905. Pp. viii, 331, with six reproductions of contemporary prints.)

THIS is a study of news under the ancien régime. Contrary to what might be expected, the modern newspaper is hardly more truly a descendant of the seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century pamphlet than the modern trade-union is descended from the medieval guild. Almost as remote a source of the French newspaper are those famous periodicals of the seventeenth century, the *Gazette de France* (1631), the *Journal des Savants* (1665), and the *Mercure Galant* (1672). Each of these, besides not being of daily issue, was an organ of special limited interests. The first daily newspaper of France appeared in 1777—the *Journal de Paris*. The author is not disposed to attribute this condition of things so much to the press restraints of the government from Charles IX. to Louis XV., as to the spirit of the age. "The press as we understand it, of free information and independent criticism", we are told (p. 20), "could not exist in old France."

Before the appearance of the newspaper, the curiosity of the public for news was satisfied through the medium of a class of professional newsmongers whose calling enriched the French language with a new word (*nouvelliste*), and the civilization of France with a new institution (*nouvellisme*). Indeed, a minor poet of the reign of Louis XIV. gained an ephemeral reputation by a long poem in the manner of Boileau's *Art Poétique*, entitled *La Novellomanie*. The wide activities of France under Richelieu and Mazarin and the spontaneous curiosity of the period of the Fronde created this class. The *nouvellistes* merely sought to satisfy the popular curiosity; they did not, and did not seek to, influence public opinion in any appreciable degree. Under Louis XIV. the intense interest of all France in the life of the court and the almost

continual absenteeism of many provincial families led the *nouvellistes* to widen the sphere of their activities and to reach out into the provinces for news acquired through special correspondents there. Merchants and bankers were solicited to add news items to their commercial letters.

The author divides these public gossipers into three classes: the *nouvellistes d'état*, the *nouvellistes de plein vent*, and the *spécialistes*, who dispensed literary, military, or other particular information. Each one of these classes had its especial rendezvous. The first class, the *politiques*, as they were sometimes called, frequented the corridors and anterooms of the Louvre, or hung upon the outer edge of the court at Versailles. Representatives of this class were generally of wealthy bourgeois ancestry, living upon the income of their *rentes*, who found a life of ease and vainglory in what they did. The wars of Louis XIV. raised the usefulness and dignity of the *nouvelliste*. Like the modern newspaper proprietor, he prided himself upon the importance, the accuracy, and, above all, the earliness of his information; one such enterprising individual actually had an agent with the army in Italy during the War of the Spanish Succession, and another at Toulon to watch the movement of the fleet. An interesting example of the prototype of a modern despatch "from our special correspondent" is given (pp. 90-91) in the shape of a letter written to Lionne from Cremona on February 4, 1702. This Lionne was the news-magnate of his day, and was a cousin of Hugues de Lionne, the famous diplomatic agent of Louis XIV. He organized a news bureau in the precincts of the Tuilleries; his sources of information were so high as to be semi-official. He had upon his "staff", besides the domestics and servants of every prominent man of affairs, the clerks of the various councils, the Cardinal d'Estrées, and even Hugues de Lionne's own son.

The open-air *nouvellistes* (*de plein vent*), as their name implies, were not the privileged few who had access to the Louvre and the Tuilleries, but humbler folks who frequented the street corners or other points of meeting. This class was not unlike the *improvvisatori* of Italy. "They spoke of everything with admirable assurance, and with the greatest volubility", we are told (p. 46), from which it may be inferred that the line drawn by them between real and imaginary news was not a clear one. The Pont Neuf was their favorite resort. The author has a vivid description of the scene as it must have been when the famous bridge was the foyer of Parisian life. Other rendezvous of the *nouvellistes* were the cloisters of the Célestins and the Cordeliers, the shaded alleys of the Luxembourg, and the Quai des Grands Augustins between the Pont Neuf and the Pont Saint Michel, the popularity of which as a headquarters for information went back to the days of the Ligue. In the eighteenth century the gardens of the Palais Royal, where the Duke of Orleans during the Regency and Philippe Égalité during the Revolution purchased public favor, became popular. In this century too, when imitation of things English became fashionable, the English coffee-house crept into favor. Then came the great Revolution and the birth of a host of daily newspapers.

It should be added in closing that the book upon which this brief survey is based is a work of collaboration. In his capacity as archivist of the Arsenal, M. Funck-Brentano came upon a large number of documents formerly harbored in the Bastille. These he has put at the disposal of M. Paul d'Estrée, who has performed the labor of composition. For the convenience of the reader who may wish to fare farther, each chapter is accompanied by references to wider reading.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*Versailles and the Court under Louis XIV.* By JAMES EUGENE FARMER. (New York: The Century Company. 1905. Pp. xii, 447, with 74 full-page illustrations and two plans.)

IN the midst of the number of shallow books that are written upon the glories of Versailles, it is good to come upon a work as substantial as this one. It must be confessed that the gorgeous "baby-blue" and gold binding and the array of sumptuous illustrations almost led into believing that it was another gift-book for holiday time. But it has been a pleasure to read so historically accurate and so well-balanced a survey of the court of the Grand Monarque. Mr. Farmer looks at things with level eyes, and has the spirit of real research (*e. g.*, p. 73, note). He has read his sources deeply, earnestly; and, having imbibed something of the spirit of the age of which he is writing, he reflects neither the prejudice of Taine nor the adulation of a Bourbonist. Two of his observations perhaps may be quoted as examples of his historical judgment. After a minute description of the mechanism of the administration and the routine life of the king, he says: "If the monarchical machine ran well, no small part of the success was due to the fact that Louis himself did all his work each day with clock-like regularity; and to dub him a king of fêtes and reviews is to render him scant justice. With the exception of Napoleon, France has never had a sovereign who worked harder or more regularly than Louis XIV." (p. 183). Again, apropos of Louis's personality, Mr. Farmer says: "The Grand Monarch was not naturally hard of heart, but he was one of the proudest men of whom history makes mention, and on the subject of his pride he has received a vast amount of criticism. It is an open question if much of that criticism is not misplaced. Louis was not a philanthropist, nor a philosopher, nor a financier, nor a builder of better lodgings for workmen; he was a king, according to his lights, and in his judgment, to be a king, was to rise and shine" (p. 210).

Mr. Farmer's book irresistibly reminds one of Ezechiel Spanheim's *Relation de la Cour de France en 1690*. Each writer's scene is the court of Louis XIV. The difference lies in the fact that Spanheim observed with his own eyes, while Mr. Farmer has looked at things through the eyes of St. Simon and Dangeau. The thing seen is the same; the point of view is much the same; the very treatment is similar. The composition of the book is a testimony to the thoroughness of the author's reading of his sources, and to the Duc de St. Simon's power of

universal observation. The reviewer has been interested in analyzing the sources upon which it is based, and for this reason has made an analysis of the authorities cited. It is evident that Mr. Farmer has chosen to read a few books and to read them thoroughly. All told, there are sixteen works cited, all of them original sources with four exceptions. By far the largest amount of the material has been quarried out of St. Simon's *Mémoires*, which are cited no less than ninety-five times (he is referred to eight times on pp. 340-341). Then follow in order: Dussieux, *Le Château de Versailles*, thirty-seven times; Dangeau, ten; the *Mémoires de la Duchesse d'Orléans*, nine; the *État de France* and the *Mercur*, each eight times; the *Mémoires* of Madame de Montespan, four; Taine, three; De Sourches's *Mémoires* and the *Œuvres de Louis XIV.*, each twice; Bossuet, once; Madame de Maintenon, the *Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Colbert*, Martin's *Histoire de France*, Guillaume Du Peyrat's *Histoire Ecclésiastique de la Cour*, and De Tilly, each once.

This is certainly a substantial foundation upon which to build a history of the court of Louis XIV. But it is astonishing not to find M. Émile Bourgeois's edition of Spanheim's *Relation* (1900) and Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV.* included. The ambassador of the elector of Brandenburg is quoted only once, and that in a way to indicate that the allusion is borrowed from the editor of St. Simon or Dangeau. In Spanheim the author would have found an exceedingly important account of the famous reproof given Colbert by the king, a reproof which, coming from such a source at such a time, probably hastened the death of the great minister. This incident is one of the most notable events connected with the building of Versailles. Louis is said to have harshly reproached Colbert for the sums of money which certain parts of the château were costing, among others the great grille d'entrée, and to have drawn a comparison between the cost of the palace and the cost of the fortresses in favor of Louvois (see Spanheim's *Relation*, pp. 314-315, and M. Bourgeois's notes).

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

*Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV.* By W. H. WILKINS, M.A., F.S.A.  
(New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company.  
1905. Two vols., pp. xxi, 350; ix, 340.)

THERE is no great addition to historical knowledge in Mr. Wilkins's story of Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV.; for the documents which were deposited in 1833 at Coutts's Bank substantiate what was already generally believed, rather than throw any new light on either the character or the actions of George IV. These documents in 1905 were removed from Coutts's Bank, and were placed among the private archives of Windsor Castle; and, on an application to the king, Mr. Wilkins was permitted to examine the papers, and to publish any extracts from them which he deemed necessary in order to establish beyond all doubt the fact of Mrs. Fitzherbert's marriage with George Prince of Wales in 1785.

On the death of George IV. in 1830, Mrs. Fitzherbert asked that her letters to him might be returned to her. The Duke of Wellington, who was then Prime Minister, refused to grant this request unless she was prepared to hand over the documents in her possession; and for the moment the matter was dropped. In 1833, however, the duke again brought up the question. Mrs. Fitzherbert was then seventy-six, and in the event of her death it was feared that the papers might pass into indiscreet hands. After some negotiation it was agreed that Mrs. Fitzherbert should be allowed to preserve certain papers which she thought necessary to prove her marriage and guard her interests; that these papers should be sealed under the seals of the Duke of Wellington and the Earl of Albemarle, who with Lord Stourton acted for Mrs. Fitzherbert; that the sealed package should be placed in safe custody at Coutts's Bank; and that all other papers, including all the letters which had passed between Mrs. Fitzherbert and George IV., should be burned. The Earl of Albemarle and the Duke of Wellington personally undertook the burning of the letters—a task which occupied several hours. The reserved papers—now for the first time given to the public—include: the certificate of the marriage, dated December 21, 1785; a letter signed by George, relating to the marriage; the will of George IV.; a mortgage on the palace at Brighton; and a memorandum written by Mrs. Fitzherbert, attached to a letter written by the clergyman who performed the marriage ceremony.

It is always a satisfaction to have settled beyond further doubt a question which has been a matter of controversy; but in spite of the flat denial given by Fox and Sheridan in the House of Commons in 1787—a denial which Fox asserted that he made from direct authority—there were very few, even in Mrs. Fitzherbert's lifetime, who did not believe that the marriage had taken place; and since the publication by Charles Langdale of the *Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert* in 1856, the question may be said to have been at rest. The only value of Mr. Wilkins's long story is to be found in the settlement of it for all time by means of the new documentary evidence. One other question it is to be hoped will be finally answered by the publication of this book. Mrs. Fitzherbert left no descendants. Neither as Mrs. Weld nor as Mrs. Fitzherbert in her youthful days, nor during her long connection with George IV., did she have any children; and all claims to royal descent through this illegal marriage are entirely without foundation.

A. G. PORRITT.

*Le Pape et l'Empereur, 1804-1815.* Par HENRI WELSCHINGER.  
(Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1905. Pp. iv, 473.)

In this work M. Welschinger has studied the conflict between Napoleon and Pius VII. from the morrow of the Concordat to the fall of the Empire. The development of the controversy, which became an open rupture in 1809 when French troops occupied Rome and carried off the pope to Savona, is briefly sketched, leaving the bulk of the

book for a detailed account of the repeated efforts of Napoleon to obtain from Pius VII. some settlement of the points at issue which would be in harmony with imperial ideas and plans.

The book is not exclusively or even principally a work of original research. At all available points the author has made free use of the labors of Artaud, Haussonville, Chotard, and others. In all such cases, however, he has displayed independence in the handling of his authorities and has usually been able to supplement them somewhat from his own investigations. Upon the ecclesiastical councils of 1809 and 1811 he has found in the Archives Nationales some valuable and hitherto unutilized materials which have enabled him to tell the story of those gatherings more in detail than was possible hitherto. Chapters v.-vii., which deal with these subjects, are a distinct contribution to knowledge.

The author's conception of history and his point of view upon the particular questions involved in the subject before him permeate the book from the first page to the last. He thinks of history as a moral science, and is frankly the partizan of the Catholic church and of Pius VII. Unquestionably the book suffers from these qualities. The subject is one which in a peculiar degree calls for a point of view which can regard the existence of antipodal ideas upon the subject of church and state as something normal and as the natural consequence of historical forces at work for centuries. It also requires a cool, dispassionate treatment which simply seeks to ascertain what was done and to explain the proceedings of the various actors with real intellectual sympathy for their varying points of view.

Aside from his conception of history and his point of view, the author's historical method exhibits grave deficiencies. One of the most perplexing questions that confront the historian of the Napoleonic period is the problem of the memoirs, and within that problem the question of the conversations ascribed to Napoleon. Welschinger does not handle either of them satisfactorily. Occasionally he exhibits scepticism in regard to some statement of a memoir writer or doubts whether a particular remark attributed to Napoleon represents his real thought on the subject, but generally all such materials when in accord with his thesis are treated as if they were of equal value with strictly contemporaneous evidence. A typical instance occurs on pages 213-215, where Talleyrand's *Memoirs* are accepted as authority for an incident at Saint Cloud on June 18, 1811. (Welschinger transfers it to the nineteenth.) Napoleon is represented as overwhelming with reproaches several bishops and as making Cardinal Fesch the particular target for his wrath. The provocation was a report of the first day's proceedings of the National Council which had appeared in the *Moniteur*, and a copy of the paper figured conspicuously in the violent scene which occurred. Talleyrand's account is followed implicitly, even to the words used by Napoleon. It would seem that the suspicions which have been aroused over the authenticity of the Talleyrand *Memoirs* ought to have made the author cautious about accepting any particular incident contained in



them, and especially when the passage in question was certainly written years after the event. It happens, moreover, that the *Moniteur* never published any such report as that which Talleyrand alleges was the occasion for Napoleon's outburst of anger. The fact that Napoleon immediately afterward consented to the selection of Fesch as president of the National Council also casts suspicion upon the authenticity of the entire incident. Possibly Welschinger has some other authority for the affair, but as his text stands it exhibits a singularly faulty method.

The critical apparatus is extremely defective. Many important statements are left without citations. There is no bibliography or discussion of authorities, save here and there a line or two in the text or the notes. There is not even a list of the editions used in the citations. As usual in French monographs, there is no index. Despite these faults, and others which would require a more extended notice, the work has considerable merit. The author's partiality for Pius VII. and his evident exaggeration of the pope's sufferings do not entirely conceal the really heroic resistance which the pope made to the tremendous pressure brought to bear upon him by Napoleon. Some strong, if not altogether conclusive arguments are brought against views of the Savona note of May 19, 1811, and the Fontainebleau Concordat which hitherto have been widely received.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*The Duke of Reichstadt (Napoleon the Second).* By EDWARD DE WERTHEIMER.—(London and New York: John Lane Company, 1905. Pp. xvi, 463.)

THIS is a free and very readable translation of Wertheimer's excellent German volume published in 1902. To the historian its value lies in its scholarly method and the new materials on which it is based. Welschinger in his *Roi de Rome* (1897), aside from some rather meagre sources in the Paris archives, contented himself mainly with printed material—old pamphlets and memoirs (especially those of Prokesch-Osten and Montbel); he made a personal visit to Vienna, but regretted to find that the Austrian archives, both public and private, "soient peu abondantes aujourd'hui en documents relatifs au fils de Napoléon" (preface, p. vi). Wertheimer shows how little founded is this regret. His biography is based primarily on sources heretofore unused: Metternich's private letters to Hudelist at Prague; the full daily reports of the Austrian secret police at home and abroad; the frequent reports and posthumous papers of the young Napoleon's governor, Count Dietrichstein; the diary of his tutor, Baron Obenaus; the private papers of the Metternich and Schwarzenberg families; and the archives of Prussia and Parma. He is thus able to correct on many a page the misstatements of memoir writers which have been accepted by historians. To give but two out of many instances: Metternich in his *Memoirs*, written long after Napoleon's fall and the unfortunate outcome of the marriage with Marie Louise, not unnaturally insists that the original idea of the



marriage was Napoleon's, and that his own attitude throughout was strictly passive and expectant. His letters at the time, however, and an unpublished memorandum evidently expressing his ideas, show his extreme eagerness to promote an arrangement which would make him appear to be the savior of the Austrian monarchy. Similarly, Prokesch-Osten overemphasizes the Duke of Reichstadt's generous unwillingness to return to France unless unquestionably desired by a majority of the French people, and the Emperor Francis's willingness to allow him to go. But the emperor's real attitude is expressed in his words to Belliard (the accuracy of which Welschinger doubts without sufficient reason): "I am well aware I could injure Louis Philippe through him [the Duke of Reichstadt], but such an idea is far removed from my thoughts. I have brought him up as a stranger to France" (p. 354). Nevertheless, the existence of "Napoleon II." continued to be a bugbear to the Orleanist monarchy until his death.

The general reader, for whom this handsome volume is evidently intended, will find that the events and persons in the life of this son of Napoleon stand out sharp, clear, and interesting. The picture with which he is familiar from Edmond Rostand's *L'Aiglon* is not, on the whole, far from the true one. In his earliest years, however, the duke was a more healthy, normal, and well-grown boy than is usually supposed. It was not till his fifteenth year that it began to be noticed that his circulation was poor, his chest too narrow, and his throat very subject to cold and catarrh, all of which were made worse by his unwillingness to protect himself properly. It was quick consumption, and not a debauchee's exhaustion, which caused his death in 1832. That he often appeared to visitors so sad, cold, and distrustful was largely due to the unhappiness and constant mystery and evasion which surrounded his earliest years at Vienna. In 1816, when he was only five years old, his French attendants were sent away, in order that all remembrance of the past might be washed from his mind. It was a great concession that he was allowed in his prayers to pray for his father, though he did not know where he was. Most pathetic is his unsatisfied curiosity on this point. One day he asked if it was true that his father was in America? in England? in the East Indies? On being assured that he was not, the boy persisted he had heard his father was in exile somewhere. "What? In exile? How could that be possible or probable?" was all his embarrassed tutor could say, and hastened to change the subject (p. 282).

Some errors have slipped into the translation: the Austrian police identification of the four-year-old King of Rome, sent to the frontiers during the Hundred Days to prevent the possibility of his abduction, is an understatement in the original ( $2\frac{1}{2}$  *Schuh hoch*), but is absurd when further reduced in the translation to "2 ft. in height" (p. 164); he was created Duke of Reichstadt July 22, 1818, not June 22 (p. 421); some proper names are mutilated, but not beyond recognition. A more serious criticism lies in the fact that Wertheimer, out of the fullness of

his knowledge of the sources, is able to give so many quotations which show a strong Napoleonic feeling in France at various times, especially in 1830, that the reader is in danger of getting the impression that France was nearer to having a Napoleon II. on the throne than was actually the fact. Nevertheless, this book with its good index and illustrations is the best on the subject.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871.* VON ALFRED STERN. Vierter Band (Zweite Abteilung, Erster Band). (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger. 1905. Pp. xviii, 617.)

THE fourth volume of Professor Alfred Stern's history of Europe is the first of the second division of his work, which is to treat of the history of Europe from 1830 to 1848. It differs neither in style nor in treatment from the volumes which have preceded it, and like them is distinguished for accuracy, thoroughness, and impartiality and shows a constant revision and extension of existing knowledge derived from the large number of new documents which Professor Stern has unearthed in London, Paris, Berlin, Frankfort, Karlsruhe, The Hague, Florence, Zurich, and Bern. A possible defect may be discerned in the limitation of the subject-matter to political history only, and in the exclusion of social, economic, and religious affairs except as they throw light on political events. A more serious defect is the absence of an index—a defect characteristic of German publications—which, in a work of reference such as this is likely to become, is a very great inconvenience. Unlike many German works it was written in a simple and direct style, wanting perhaps at times in smoothness and elegance, but nevertheless always interesting and suggestive.

The present volume possesses a unity that is due to its treatment of a single theme, namely the Revolution of 1830 in France, its immediate consequences, and the reaction that everywhere followed. Beginning with the publication of the July Ordinances, it carries the history of the July Monarchy to the inauguration of the Périer ministry; and then, following up the effects of the revolution, it deals with the revolt in the Netherlands, the uprising in Poland, the various insurrectionary movements in Italy that mark the second stage in the early history of the Risorgimento, the agitation in Germany, the constitutional struggle in Switzerland, and the attitude of the Powers toward the organizations classed under the general head of Young Europe. In the case of each country except Belgium, where the events in the founding of the young kingdom are traced to 1840, the narrative closes with the events which mark the first stages of the reaction: the passing of the September laws of 1835 in France, the restoration of Russia's power in Poland in 1832, the seizure of Ancona by the French and the withdrawal of the English representative from the conference at Rome in the same year, the Vienna conferences of 1834 that formed the high-water mark of Metter-

nich's influence in Germany, the Münchengrätz treaty of 1833, and the temporary success of the Central European powers in their effort to coerce Switzerland into denying the right of asylum to the members of the secret societies. The remaining chapters deal with Spain and Portugal in the throes of the Carlist and Miguelist uprisings; with Turkey, Greece, and Russia involved in the after consequences of the Greek Revolutions, the assault of Mehemet Ali, and the negotiations that preceded the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi; with England and the agitation for reforms, electoral, parliamentary, industrial, and municipal—states that felt less directly the revolutionary spirit. The volume closes with an appendix of nine documents selected from those examined in the various European archives.

As far as I can judge, Professor Stern's researches have thrown the greatest light on the Belgian revolution and on the dealings of the Powers with Young Europe. Excellent as is his chapter on England, it contains nothing new except in the case of a few details drawn from Graham Wallas's *Life of Francis Place* (1898) which have not hitherto found their way into the general histories. For his treatment of local conditions in England Professor Stern has depended on the writings of Hans von Nostitz, *Das Aufsteigen des Arbeiterstandes in England* (Jena, 1900); P. F. Aschrott, *Das englische Armenwesen* (1886); Carl Hugo (Lindemann), *Städteverwaltung und Munizipal-Sozialismus in England* (1897); and Josef Redlich's *Englische Lokalverwaltung* (1901). Except for Wallas's book, noted above, and a German translation of Sidney Webb's *History of Trade Unionism*, he has largely ignored English works on these same subjects.

Turning to the narrative, we are impressed with the tremendous, almost pathetic earnestness with which the reports from Paris were received. A prominent revolutionist in Bologna declared that posterity would place the three wonderful days of July beside the six days of creation, and another in Germany hailed the pavements of the boulevards as "sanctified" by the blood that had been spilled thereon. A Spanish poet welcomed the victory, not as Parisian, but as European. Stern quotes a remarkable statement by a contemporary witness which is of interest to Americans. When Lafayette at the Hôtel de Ville hesitated what course to take, the envoy from the United States won him over to the Orleanist cause by saying, "I give you my word that your friends in America will be much more pleased if you aid in the erection of a free constitutional monarchy in France than if you attempt to establish an unstable republic." Of the London Conference of 1830 and its effect on Metternich's policy, Stern writes: "Material help from Austria for the king of the Netherlands was out of the question. At first Metternich had hoped to formulate some common plan of action with the Eastern Powers before an understanding had been reached with France. But instead of this he was compelled to see the Western Powers in agreement with each other behind his back." He gives an excellent account of Louis Napoleon's conspiracy in Rome in 1830, and

has a very appreciative and just comment upon Mazzini based upon the latter's famous remark: "Young Europe! that is the field of freedom in the nineteenth century. Italy must plant her banner in this common field. The Italian legion must take its stand beside the rank and file of France, Belgium, and Poland."

One of his most interesting pages deals with the last days of the Duke of Reichstadt, and he bases his conclusions on the work of Wertheimer, which has been recently translated into English: "Before the Revolution in France [the duke] had revelled in the thought that if the way to France should be forever cut off he would become another Prince Eugene for Austria. The fall of Charles X. opened up a larger world for his reveries. Even with the elevation of Louis Philippe the great drama on the Seine did not seem entirely closed to him. The Belgian revolt touched him only so far that he foresaw the probability of a war. But the Polish revolt roused in him the liveliest ambition to place himself at the head of so brave a people. When his mother fled from Parma, he wished to hasten immediately to her aid. But it was always his faith in his rights as a 'prince of France' that had the uppermost place in his mind." Twice in the summer of 1831 Metternich make plans for placing the Duke of Reichstadt on the throne of France, and these plans were in full swing when this strange weakling died in 1832. Truly, as Stern says, "Mit ihm verschwand eine der tragischsten Gestalten der neueren Geschichte Europas."

The work is full, not only of valuable information, but of sound historical judgments, and even in its present incompleted form should be the constant companion of the student of nineteenth-century history.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The Life of Granville George Leveson Gower, Second Earl Granville, K. G., 1815-1891.* By LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Two vols., pp. xx, 541; xvi, 536.)

ON the last day of March, 1891, the second Earl Granville died, in his seventy-sixth year. For more than a third of a century he had been the official leader of the Liberal party in the House of Lords. Lord Granville was a most exceptionally attractive personality. Meeting him socially only in the most casual way and as a much younger man, forty years have in the case of the present writer quite failed to dim the memory of that ineffable charm. His was a blended fascination of manner, of tone, and of expression which instinctively inspired friendliness and invited confidence. As respects character, ideals, bearing, and achievements he typified all that was distinctively best in the British aristocracy.

Born in 1815, educated at Eton and at Oxford, Lord Leveson, as he was then by courtesy called, took his seat at Westminster, as the newly elected member from Morpeth, in 1836—the last year of the first reform

Parliament. He was then twenty-one. At twenty-five he began official life as Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs in the closing days of the Melbourne Ministry, Lord Palmerston being Secretary. Appointed in early March, 1840, in August, 1841, he found himself, in common with the rest of the Melbourne government, out of office. Translated to the Lords on the death of his father, the first Earl Granville, January 8, 1846, he there soon attracted attention, and the keen-eyed Lord Aberdeen pronounced him from the other side of the House "the best man they've got". Not, however, until the closing days of 1851, and when he was in his thirty-seventh year, did Granville's time come; and it then came very suddenly, and as a result of the historic break between Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston. Lord Palmerston was curtly dismissed from the office of Foreign Secretary December 19, 1851, and three days later the appointment of Lord Granville in his stead was announced. Exactly two months afterward Palmerston had his famous "tit-for-tat with John Russell", and Granville's first brief tenure of the Foreign Office came to a close. Nearly twenty years were to pass before he regained it. In 1855, however, he became leader on the Liberal side in the House of Lords, and that position he retained, with one brief break, for thirty-six years, and until 1891. In 1859 he was summoned by the Queen and the Prince Consort, with whom he was a favorite minister, to save them from Russell and Palmerston, both of whom they disliked and dreaded, by forming a ministry. The attempt failed; and the memorable Palmerston-Russell-Gladstone administration then came into existence, lasting from June, 1859, to Lord Palmerston's death, October 18, 1865. It thus covered the entire period of the American Civil War; of which, presently. In this administration Lord Granville held the post of Lord President of the Council; but he was also, after the Prince Consort's death in December, 1861, the most trusted personal adviser, and almost the confidant, of the Queen. Going out of office with Lord Russell in 1866, in 1870 Lord Granville returned to it, with Mr. Gladstone as Prime Minister; and, thenceforth to the end of his life, he looked to Mr. Gladstone as his political chief, and in the Lords was the representative of Mr. Gladstone's policies. At the time of the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, consequently, and throughout the Geneva arbitration, Lord Granville was at the head of the Foreign Office. Going out with Mr. Gladstone in 1874, in 1880 Granville was again summoned by the Queen, and asked to form a government; this time he was appealed to as against Gladstone himself, whose return to power and personal relations with her the Queen shrank from even more than she had before shrunk from contact with Russell and Palmerston. He was again Foreign Secretary in the second Gladstone ministry (1880-1885); and when Mr. Gladstone rode back into power in February, 1886, Lord Granville, ever faithful to his chief, came back with him—but not again to the Foreign Office. He now accepted the

Colonial Office, and acted in it until the fall of that short-lived ministry in the following July. He did not again hold office.

Such was the man depicted by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice in the two bulky but readable volumes under consideration. In every way very competent for it, the biographer has done his work sympathetically. Himself a member of the order of which Lord Granville was the consummate type, he also has had diplomatic, as well as parliamentary and literary, experience; and he thus depicts and writes from the inside. He has an abiding eye for the picturesque, as well as a redeeming sense of humor; and the great historical element of individuality is uppermost. We thus get down to the "true inwardness" of the situation, seeing the actors in their undress and listening to their familiar talk.

Turning to those portions of the book more peculiarly interesting to Americans, some additional light is thrown on (1) the proposed recognition of the Confederacy in the autumn of 1862; and, in consequence, (2) on the Treaty of Washington, and its outcome in the Geneva arbitration. Concerning the first, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice here brings to light the whole of a letter of great interest, a fragment only of which has been heretofore published, a letter written by Lord Granville from Gotha, where he was then in attendance on the Queen, to Lord Russell, then Foreign Secretary. It was dated September 27, and related exclusively to "the present state of the American question".

The Union arms throughout the months of July and August, 1862, had sustained a series, almost unbroken, of reverses. The Confederacy had not only asserted its right to be recognized as a belligerent, but it was a victorious belligerent. Europe was suffering for want of the great spinning staple—cotton; and, in England, Lancashire was bankrupt and starving. The Mexican expedition of the French Emperor had overrun that country, and he was urging on the British Cabinet an aggressive attitude toward the United States; and Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell were very much inclined to give ear to him. At this juncture Palmerston, as Prime Minister, wrote (September 14) to Russell, Foreign Secretary, suggesting that the time for joint action "upon the basis of separation" had come. This suggestion strongly commended itself to the Secretary, and the "two ancient masters" thus concurring, the thing was as good as settled; but Mr. Gladstone, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was then advised of what was proposed, and to it he gave his assent. This made assurance doubly sure; for, as Lord Granville had a few months before, and in another connection, written to Lord Canning, "He [Gladstone] Johnny and Pam are a formidable phalanx when they are united in opposition to the whole Cabinet in foreign matters" (I. 346). And in the present case a large majority of the Cabinet were with the "formidable phalanx". The strangely unexpected now occurred. A meeting of the Cabinet was fixed for the twenty-third of October. Mr. Adams got an inkling of what was on foot, and was greatly disturbed. "For a fortnight", he wrote, "my mind has been running so strongly on all this night and day that it

seems almost to threaten my life." Just then (October 7) Mr. Gladstone delivered that famous Newcastle speech in which he declared that Jefferson Davis had "made a nation", and that the independence of the Confederacy and the dissolution of the American Union were as certain "as any event yet future and contingent could be". That speech, a marvel of indiscretion, though at the moment it caused in the mind of Mr. Adams deep despair, in reality saved for him the situation.

Speaking for himself, Mr. Gladstone had foreshadowed a ministerial policy. The utterance was inspired. In his *Life of Granville* the principle of the so-called collectivity of the British Cabinet is somewhat discussed by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, and the point clearly made that ministers are in no wise free to put forward each "his own views at large public meetings and elsewhere" (II. 322). This Mr. Gladstone had now done. Moreover, it was notorious in ministerial circles that the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were not in general harmony. On the contrary, Lord Palmerston disliked and habitually thwarted Mr. Gladstone; and Mr. Gladstone instinctively distrusted Lord Palmerston. A year before, the two had been "in violent antagonism" on financial questions. For two months, Granville wrote, "Gladstone has been on half-cock of resignation".

The embers still glowed hot beneath the ashes. The Newcastle indiscretion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer kindled them into a flame, and the Premier decided that the offending minister must forthwith be disciplined, and that severely. He therefore intimated to Sir George Cornwall Lewis, another and most influential member of the Cabinet, and head of the War Office, that if he (Lewis) did not take this function on himself, it must devolve on the head of the Cabinet in person. On the fourteenth of October, therefore, Sir George Lewis, speaking at Hereford, very pointedly controverted the position taken by his colleague one week before at Newcastle. The blind goddess had intervened for the preservation of the American Union!

And now it was that Lord Granville's influence made itself potently, perhaps decisively, felt. At the time he was in personal attendance on the Queen at Gotha, where she was in the worst stages of that morbid condition following Prince Albert's death which for a time threatened her sanity. There has always been a vague, intangible tradition, based chiefly on household gossip, that at this time Her Majesty was, as Lord Granville on another occasion expressed it (I. 453), "up in her stirrups", and "sternly warned her government against any manner of interference" in the struggle going on in America. This subject has been elsewhere fully discussed,<sup>1</sup> and the conclusion reached that, out of consideration for the Queen's known wishes and critical condition, both nervous and mental, it was deemed best to defer at least the consideration of important questions of policy which might precipitate a crisis. It is now made apparent that such was not the case. There is no evidence

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, second series, XVII. 441-448; XVIII. 123-154.



whatever that, after the Trent affair and the death of the Prince Consort, the Queen showed any personal interest in the American struggle or sought to influence in the slightest the policy of the ministers in regard to it. Had she evinced such interest, or exerted any influence on the ministry, it would have been through Lord Granville. The personal correspondence which took place between the Queen and Granville at about this time and subsequently has already been referred to; it is as curious as it is conclusive on the point under discussion. On her part it is touching in its outbursts—its appeals for sympathy and aid. In September and October, 1862, Lord Granville was then in personal attendance upon her on the continent, and there for the express purpose of communicating with her on questions of business. Lord Russell sent him notice of the Cabinet meeting called for October 23; and, October 1, Granville wrote to his colleague, Lord Stanley of Alderley, familiarly "Ben", that Palmerston had already broached the idea of an offer of mediation and subsequent recognition; and he adds: "I have written to Johnny my reasons for thinking it decidedly premature. I, however, suspect you will settle to do so! Pam, Johnny and Gladstone would be in favour of it; and probably Newcastle. I do not know about the others. It appears to me a great mistake." Here, in a familiar letter, is no reference whatever to the Queen, no intimation that she feels any interest in the question at issue, or the policy to be adopted. In the letter to Lord Russell referred to as already sent, Granville discussed the question of intervention at length and in detail. Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice prints the letter in full (I. 442-444). In it also there is no reference to the Queen. The writer refers to further Confederate victories as something "to be hoped"; but advises waiting for them, and regards a change of policy at that time as unwise. This was exactly the view of the matter subsequently taken by Lord Palmerston.

Lord Granville wrote to Lord Russell September 27. The letter probably reached the Foreign Office on the twenty-ninth, and was at once forwarded by Lord Russell to Lord Palmerston at Broadlands. Two days later, October 2, it was returned to Lord Russell with a hesitating comment: "Ten days or a fortnight more may throw a clearer light upon future prospects." Lord Russell, however, was disposed to move forward in the direction agreed upon, and proceeded to prepare the confidential Cabinet circular in furtherance thereof. This was but the third; four days later, on the seventh, Mr. Gladstone delivered himself at Newcastle. In the mood in which the Premier then was, that settled the matter. The Cabinet meeting called for the twenty-third, the probable outcome of which Lord Granville had forecast in his letter to "Ben" of October 1, was postponed, and never afterward notified. Mr. Gladstone had been "called down"—had received an intimation that he was neither the ministry nor yet its accredited mouthpiece.

None the less it was, for the cause of the American Union, a very close thing; and the interior working of the springs and wires which



brought about the final result are now for the first time fully revealed. Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone worked on different lines to one end, and the "two ancient masters" happily paused before taking more "dangerous steps" which, as things then were, could hardly have failed "to set all Europe in a blaze". The most curious feature of the situation as now revealed is, however, that Mr. Adams was at the moment altogether wrong in his understanding of the influences at work. He thought Palmerston the evil genius of the situation, and the source of hostile machinations; Earl Russell was, on the whole, America's friend. In reality it was, as we now know, the other way. At the critical moment Russell was disposed to go forward; it was Palmerston who hesitated, and stopped.

As respects the Treaty of Washington, Lord Edmond's book is distinctly disappointing. No new or additional light is shed upon it. Throughout the negotiation of the treaty Lord Granville was Foreign Secretary, and from the first step in the negotiation to the Geneva award it bears the unmistakable mark of his handiwork. It was in reality his greatest achievement—a monument of judgment, tact, good temper, forbearance, and foresight. It would seem there must have been many informal letters among the papers of Lord Granville throwing gleams of light from Washington and Geneva on what was then said and done. If so, his biographer has made small use of them. The Washington negotiations are disposed of in four pages; when, however, he comes to the rocks, shoals, and quicksands through which, before it reached the Geneva haven, the treaty subsequently either floundered or was guided, there is more detail, though little that is new.

*Histoire du Second Empire.* Par PIERRE DE LA GORCE. Vols. VI. and VII. (Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1903, 1905. Pp. 466, 444.)

THE first volume of M. La Gorce's *History of the Second Empire* was published in 1894, and now, eleven years later, appears the seventh and final volume, closing with the eventful day of Sedan and the erection of the government of the Republic in Paris. Few works on modern French history have won more successfully the favor of the reading public of France, and it is noteworthy that the earlier volumes have already passed into their sixth and seventh editions. Even volume six, first published in 1903, is already in its fourth edition, and we can say with certainty that the final volume, dealing with that terrible month of war from August 7 to September 2, 1870, yields in no way to the preceding volumes in the absorbing interest which it arouses. There is no history of the war of 1870 that can compare with the account given in these volumes, and no history which in my judgment measures out praise and blame in an honest effort to determine the causes of success and failure with greater impartiality than does that of M. La Gorce.

Volume six opens with the ministry of January 2, 1870—*le ministère Ollivier des honnêtes gens*—and traces with fullness and care the auspicious opening of its career; its relations with ultras and irreconcilables; its magnificent but abortive projects of reform; its policy toward the Vatican council and the awkward situation which that gathering engendered—a situation that M. La Gorce treats as a moderate sympathizer, hostile to Venillot and Père Hyacinthe alike; its attitude toward the plebescite of May, 1870, upon which the author has some very suggestive comments; until in chapter 29 it reaches the burning question of the Hohenzollern candidature, that instrument of evil which provoked the final crisis, a question to which M. La Gorce devotes 200 of the 434 pages of his text.

In these pages the reader will find no striking novelties, though much new evidence has been introduced and a number of gaps in the story have been filled. In the main, the account is straightforward and reasonable, rarely containing expressions of opinion that are either harsh or unfair. Bismarck's policy, particularly in relation to the Hohenzollern difficulty, is a difficult subject for a French historian to discuss; not because it worked humiliation for France, but because to a Frenchman it seems dishonorable and unsportsmanlike. M. La Gorce does not hesitate to score his own people for their mistakes, their incompetence, and their hot-headedness; but he constantly lets the reader see that he deems the methods of Bismarck, Moltke, and Roon, and even at times those of King William, as lacking in those qualities of honor that are so dear to the Frenchman's heart. He takes the ground that the German leaders did not play the game fairly, or, as one might put it, that they hit below the belt too often. In contrast he calls attention to the fact that both in public and in private the Prussians were making "a perpetual appeal to the Most High. The God whom they invoked was a militant God, a God of war, a just God so long as he served Prussian ambitions. Jesus of the Gospels would have repudiated the conception, which, whether falsified by intention or altered by passion, was sufficient to hold the soldier to his duty and to elevate his soul." To M. La Gorce there is something repulsive in the contrast.

One cannot help feeling that to M. La Gorce the conduct of Prussia throughout the period before and during the war was lacking in nobility and high-mindedness. In reading the account of the Hohenzollern candidature, of the Ems interviews, of the scene about the dinner-table in Berlin when the telegram from Ems was manipulated, of the conference after Sedan, of the treatment of French prisoners in the isthmus d'Iges, we must constantly keep in mind the Frenchman's point of view, and make allowances for the national temperament. At times one gets the impression that M. La Gorce, although nowhere taking the position of a partizan, deems the Prussians of an inferior and grosser breed, parvenus among the nations. Yet he never fails to recognize his historical obligations, and we nowhere meet with such a long-drawn-out piece of special pleading as is to be found in Sybel's twenty-fourth book. M. La

Gorce is the more honest historian: he is willing to admit a great many of the mistakes that the Germans charge against the French, and no one, not even Taine himself, has analyzed with more searching thoroughness the weakness of the national character. On the other hand, from the beginning to the end of Sybel's account there is not a single word of criticism of the part played by the makers of German unity in their dealings with France. German writers should remember the well-known historical axiom of Bishop Stubbs. I think, he says, there are few lessons more necessary for men to learn than this one; namely, that there are few questions on which as much may not be said on one side as on the other, and that there are none at all on which all the good are on one side and all the bad on the other, or all the wise on one side and all the fools on the other. Sybel would have us believe that there is but one side to the question; whereas M. La Gorce, who is vastly more interesting and complete in his account, is willing to present both sides of the case and is therefore by far the more trustworthy.

M. La Gorce has made use of the reminiscences of Major Von Versen, which disclose the fact, unknown to Sybel, that Bismarck in April, 1870, despatched Major Von Versen secretly to Spain to study the situation and to see what were the chances for Prince Leopold, and that the major returned convinced of the desirability of the candidacy of Leopold and became henceforth an active agent in his behalf. M. La Gorce shows further that, through the influence of Von Versen and Lothar Bucher, Prim was won over to the Bismarckian scheme; and, though he well knew the dangerous character of the intrigue with which he was identifying himself, he hoped that the whole matter might be conducted in secret until he should be able to win over Napoleon as Cavour had done at Plombières and Bismarck at Biarritz. This plan explains the adjournment of the Spanish Cortes, which is so inexplicable to Sybel, inasmuch as Prim desired to have his hands free during the summer of 1870. But to Prim's discomfiture the news of the candidacy leaked out, probably through the indiscretion of the zealous Salazar; and the French minister at Madrid, M. Mercier de Lostende, telegraphed the news to his government. Thus the matter which, had it been discussed privately between Prim and Napoleon, might have been settled without serious trouble, fell into the hands of Gramont, minister of *la grande politique*. The Hohenzollern question came before the world, and Gramont was all ready to make it a cause for war. Of Prim's policy, first presented by Léonardon in the *Revue Historique* in 1900 (LXXIV. 287-340), Sybel has not a word.

The instructions sent to Benedetti at Ems M. La Gorce considers sincere but inopportune, and he does not hesitate to commend Benedetti for modifying them even at the risk of Gramont's anger. King William's graciousness, upon which German writers lay stress, he deems too habitual to be significant, and the reply in which King William distinguishes between his functions as head of the family and as king of Prussia M. La Gorce sharply criticizes as the clever evasion of one

who did not wish to commit himself, as another example of the equivocal answers that had emanated earlier from Thile of the Prussian Foreign Office. He deems the demand for guaranties an unfortunate and fatal error, forced upon Gramont by the newspapers and the Duvernois interpellation, which Gramont at first repudiated but afterward appropriated, and in turn with the aid of the Empress forced upon the ministry and the Emperor. How Gramont won over Napoleon, M. La Gorce thinks we shall never know, but he is inclined to throw the ultimate responsibility upon the Empress, of whose share in shaping the policy of the government in those decisive and fatal hours he has but one opinion. "From all the unpublished correspondence and private papers we receive but a single impression—so far as France was concerned she was the artisan of the war." At the same time he gives full weight to *la surexcitation extraordinaire* into which the news of the Hohenzollern candidature threw journals, military leaders, chamber, and court—an excitement due, not to loss of intelligence, as a contemporary once said, but to loss of presence of mind. France of 1870 was after all the France of Boulanger, the Panama scandal, and the Dreyfus affair. Herein lies the secret of Bismarck's motive in adapting the telegram from Ems. The curtailed statement produced, as Bismarck intended it should produce, the effect of a red rag upon the Gallic bull.

The account of the war covers a volume and a third, and is clear, graphic, admirably arranged, and easy to follow. From the beginning to the end it is a tale of insufficient military preparations and incompetent leadership as far as France is concerned. While praising the bravery and self-sacrifice of the French soldier, M. La Gorce shows that the bravery of the rank and file was everywhere neutralized by the general paralysis which excessive centralization, fear of responsibility, and want of precise instructions brought about in the organization of the army. The illness of the Emperor, due to kidney trouble, was not only demoralizing in itself, but was also a faithful reflection of the destiny of France.

M. La Gorce throws the responsibility of defeat, not only upon the inadequate preparations, but upon the incompetence of the generals as well. De Failly and MacMahon lost the battle of Wörth, Frossard and Bazaine that of Forbach; and with these defeats, hope disappeared. The opinion expressed of Bazaine for his failure at Forbach anticipates the final judgment passed upon him after he became the head of the army (VII. 34-35): "He was irresolute as are all men of mediocre ability, unduly cautious as are all egoists, and affable, though his good nature was somewhat of a snare. He had desires that were weak rather than definite plans that were strong. He adopted subterfuge to avoid showing his embarrassment; dreamed, even amidst the greatest disorders, of saving his reputation and of becoming perhaps the man of the hour. Then when the situation became too complicated for his intelligence, when he himself was wholly entangled in the thread of his own thoughts, he assumed the position of a fatalist, displaying an

almost apathetic indifference which was incredible in the midst of such great dangers. So he remained at Metz, a hindrance to action, hesitating because of timidity or policy, withdrawing little by little into an inaccessible solitude, losing caste by degrees in the eyes of the soldiers, awaiting vaguely any solution that chance might offer, forming designs that were half plans and half intrigues, and allowing the days to slip by one by one when alone safety might be assured." Little wonder that M. La Gorce can exclaim after Bazaine's narrow escape from capture in the battle of Rezonville, "Even to the end fortune followed the Prussians, for Bazaine was saved for the army and for France."

Now that M. La Gorce has completed his history, it is in order for some publisher to consider the possibility of a version in English for the benefit of the English-reading public. Judicious pruning would reduce it considerably in size and bring it within the compass of half a dozen volumes. Sybel's history, which is less popular in style and treatment than is that of M. La Gorce, found a publisher; and there is no reason why a translation of the *History of the Second Empire* should not do the same. It would meet the demand which exists and must always exist for a history of Europe during the eventful years from 1850 to 1870.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Lord Randolph Churchill.* By WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL, M.P. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1906. Two vols., pp. xviii, 564; ix, 532.)

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, judged only by the length of time he was of the Salisbury Cabinets (1885-1886 and 1886-1892) does not occupy a large place among English statesmen. But this fact notwithstanding, the life which Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill has written of his father will assuredly rank among the great English political biographies of the nineteenth century. It will have to be read—nay, even more than read—it will have to be carefully studied by all who would be well versed in the political history of England, especially party history, from the Reform Act of 1867 to the end of the Unionist administration of 1886-1892.

Among biographies of statesmen and politicians of the Victorian era Mr. Churchill's two volumes must be placed next after Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, and alongside Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice's *Life of Earl Granville* and Charles Stuart Parker's *Life of Sir Robert Peel*; for it has all the finality and authority of these biographies, because like them it is based on letters and documents. What Parker's life of Peel does for the Toryism of the period between the peace after Waterloo and the break-up of the old Tory party after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, Mr. Churchill's life of Lord Randolph Churchill does for the newer Toryism, for the Toryism which dates from Disraeli's leadership of the House of Commons, and which for the present may be said to have come to an end with the general election of 1906. Lord Randolph

Churchill died in 1895. But before he ceased to be a political force, the Tory and Unionist party was coming under the domination of Mr. Chamberlain, and was entering on the era which came to an end with the complete and utter rout of the party at the general election in the early days of 1906.

Lord Randolph Churchill's place in English political history is not to be measured by the few months in which he was Secretary of State for India or the still shorter period in which he was Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons. In any political history covering the last half of Queen Victoria's reign he must have a prominent place by reason of the enormous influence which he exercised over the Tory party in Parliament and in the constituencies in the years which preceded and in those which immediately followed the Reform Acts of 1884-1885. How Lord Randolph Churchill came to exercise this great influence, what he aimed at as regards shaping the policy of the Tory party, and also as regards legislation, is all detailed in Mr. Winston Churchill's biography; and the career of Lord Randolph Churchill is followed with a detachment that is indeed remarkable in the case of a man who is following out the career of his father. Perhaps this detachment is due to the fact that Mr. Winston Churchill was never associated with his father in the House of Commons; that he was too young to be in political life at all during the few years in which his father was the outstanding figure among the Tories and the Unionists in the House of Commons, and the most popular leader of the Tory party in all the great urban centres of England which at that time were giving their adherence to the Tory and Unionist party.

Whatever the reason may be, the detachment with which Mr. Churchill has written these volumes is as remarkable as the style in which they are written. There are eleven hundred pages, and there is not a page that could be spared. The volumes are much more than a history of the life and times of Lord Randolph Churchill. They form the best history extant of Toryism from Beaconsfield to Salisbury and of Unionism for almost the whole period that the Unionism of 1886 survived. Moreover the history covers many phases of English life from Lord Randolph Churchill's days at Eton and Oxford to the end of Queen Victoria's reign—phases of political, official, and social life in Ireland as well as in England which do not always receive due attention in English political memoirs or political history.

EDWARD PORRITT.

*A History of Our Own Times from the Diamond Jubilee, 1897, to the Accession of King Edward VII.* Vols. IV. and V. By JUSTIN MCCARTHY. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1905. Pp. vii, 320; v, 303.)

As an easy and superficial record of the happenings of the last years of the reign of Queen Victoria, these two new volumes of Justin

McCarthy's *History of Our Own Times* may find a place with American readers. They gather up in readable form that very recent history which, while tolerably fresh in one's memory, is often exceedingly difficult to verify. It is essentially the history of the newspaper files of the years from 1897 to 1901; but these are difficult of access, awkward to handle, and inconvenient to refer to because unindexed. These volumes supply the place of the newspaper files, and must be regarded and criticized rather as the work of a reporter or a journalist than as that of a historian.

There is no evidence of research, no pretense at scholarly writing or verification by means of references in this history. This might be unobjectionable if Mr. McCarthy had kept himself closely to narrating the course of events. But he is nothing if not partizan, and readers are asked to accept not only the facts of recent history, but also the somewhat crude judgments of the historian as to what ought to have been the course of affairs. They are informed in a light and airy manner just how the governments of Great Britain and the great powers of Europe ought to have behaved in such crises as the Boxer trouble or the Cretan insurrection, and how all ensuing difficulties and entanglements would have been avoided had only Mr. McCarthy been appointed adviser-general on these critical occasions. "The policy which the European Powers ought to have pursued", writes McCarthy (IV. 39) of the Cretan question of 1897, "was to declare directly and positively that if Crete really desired by the voices of her Christian populations to be made part of the kingdom of Greece, and if Greece desired the union, the Greek race must have its will . . . Thus the whole Greek question might have been settled without any further effusion of blood instead of remaining for settlement as it does to this very day."

Although these volumes may at times be handy books of reference, they must not be depended upon for fullness or accuracy. Mr. McCarthy is always cordial in his allusions to the United States. Yet in the chapter devoted to the Boxer trouble and the integrity of China, he nowhere mentions Mr. Hay, or gives any credit to him and the American government for the great part he took, first in getting into communication with the legations, and secondly in preserving China from what at one time seemed the inevitable fate of partition among the powers. Several other curious lacks of acquaintance with current American history might be cited. In the account of the war with Spain, Mr. McCarthy speaks (IV. 205) of the "speedy destruction" of "the war array of Spain in the harbors of Havana", leaving his readers to gather the exact meaning of this phrase. He does not mention the victory of Admiral Dewey, nor give any reason for the cession of the Philippines to the United States. He concludes his account of the war by saying (*ibid.*): "Cuba and the Philippine Islands therefore became part of the dominion of the United States . . . , and it need hardly be said that the Cuban population enjoyed from the first the immense advantage of having been made a part of the great Republic."



A large part of both volumes is taken up with the "mainly about people" chat so familiar to readers of McCarthy's newspaper and magazine contributions. Even these sections of the work, where the author ought to be most at home, are frequently lacking in accuracy or completeness. In enumerating the deaths in 1897, he gives a sketch of the life of Henry George, and adds: "He was more than once urged by his followers to put himself forward as a candidate for public office, to which his own inclinations would never have led him" (IV. 225); but not a word is said of his candidature for the mayoralty of New York nor of the tragic circumstance that his death occurred within five days of the election in which many of his followers believed that he had at least a fighting chance.

At the best, as for example in the accounts of Parliamentary sessions and of the course of affairs in Ireland, the history in these volumes is good partizan journalism, readable, superficially accurate, and accessible. Unfortunately it is not uniformly at its best, and at its worst it is very poor journalism and lacks all these recommendations. There is an index; but there is no chronology, and dates are used so sparingly that one may read the whole story of Queen Victoria's death without discovering, except by referring to the previous chapter, in what year of the new century she died.

A. G. PORRITT.

*Russia and its Crisis.* By PAUL MILYUKOV. [Crane Lectures, University of Chicago, 1903.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1905. Pp. xiii, 589.)

It is difficult to know how to describe in a few words the unusual kind of work which is here offered under this title. One might suggest that it seems to be a study in the correlation of institutional history with what, for lack of a better term, may be called political ideology. The scope is certainly very comprehensive, and one can quite agree with the statement in the preface that the book is "the result of long years of study, devoted to the explanation of the Russian present by the Russian past". Professor Milyoukov takes as the premise of the discussion a general formula, to the effect that institutional development, in order to be stable, ought never to be divorced from popular sanction; or, to quote the words of the text, "a fact", meaning thereby an institution, "in order to grow into a tradition, must become an idea" (p. 160). This formula Professor Milyoukov applies to the whole course of Russian history, both political and religious; and he explains the present strained relations between government and society by tracing the divergence of Church and State from their "real tradition". As an interpretation of the contemporary crisis in Russia, it is certainly very suggestive. As an elucidation of the Liberal theory of this crisis, in all its historical bearings, there is nothing in English more complete.

In regard to the merits of the conclusion which Professor Milyoukov reaches, there is, of course, much room for difference of opinion. To



review a long course of history in the light of a single formula, however inclusive, can never be altogether satisfactory except to the one who himself propounds the formula. And this must be particularly true where, as in the present case, the work is controversial and confessedly partizan. One detects a trace of this in Professor Milyoukov's refutation of the "Nationalistic Idea" (chapters II., III., and IV.). As a cosmopolitan liberal and something of a doctrinaire, he is naturally out of sympathy with this "Idea", partly because it springs from an instinctive feeling of pride in national institutions simply because they are national. As a partizan reformer he cannot share in such a feeling, and he would have us dismiss it as "unscientific". Equally open to exception is the conclusion in which he summarizes his study of autocracy in the light of tradition. To quote from the text: "And thus it is, even after centuries of existence, that no legal and moral tradition of autocracy can be found to exist either in institutions or in minds; and so nothing is opposed to its overthrow except the mere fact of its being there, in full possession of power". This is indeed very strange language. One is tempted to cite the case of the election of the Romanovs in the seventeenth century. If there was no such legal or moral tradition in men's minds, why was a new line of czars instituted? Was it simply to offer them *de facto* sovereignty, and leave the question of sovereignty *de jure* unsettled till a crisis? It would seem that according to Professor Milyoukov's theory of sovereignty, the determination of authority *de jure* lies only in the moral sanction of liberal thinkers. Truly a convenient tribunal before which to implead autocracy!

In regard to style, it must be remembered that the author is a Russian and here writing in a foreign language, so that it would be ungracious to quibble over an occasional vagueness of phrase. The book is not free from the national vice of prolixity, which at times renders the reading almost prohibitive. This difficulty is increased by a topical instead of a chronological arrangement. The former was unquestionably the better to adopt, but in the attempt to remedy the detached character of each chapter recourse has been had to a superfluous number of cross-references. These reach the extraordinary total of one hundred and twenty-five, or an approximate average of one to every four pages. It is much to be regretted that Professor Milyoukov has stirred up the vexed question of the transliteration of Russian proper names by inventing a system peculiarly his own. Kiev becomes Keeyev and Bakunin Bakoonin, while the dramatic quality of Ivan the Terrible loses all its national flavor by his being converted into a sort of wax figure with the cosmopolitan label of "John IV." The work would be much improved for American readers if it could be re-edited and rearranged. Although specialized in its treatment, it is altogether too valuable a contribution to English books on Russia to be left unreadable.

C. E. FRYER.

## BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*Vikings of the Pacific.* The Adventures of the Explorers who came from the West, Eastward; Bering, the Dane; the Outlaw Hunters of Russia; Benyowsky, the Polish Pirate; Cook and Vancouver, the English Navigators; Gray of Boston, the Discoverer of the Columbia; Drake, Ledyard, and other Soldiers of Fortune on the West Coast of America. By A. C. LAUT. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1905. Pp. xviii, 349.)

THIS attractive volume comprises a series of essays on topics related to the exploration of the North Pacific coast. The author does not profess to give a complete history of discovery in this region. She says in her preface (p. viii): "The Spaniards of the Southwest—even when they extended their explorations into the Northwest—have not been included in this volume, for the simple reason they would require a volume by themselves. . . . Other Pacific coast explorers, like La Pérouse, are not included here because they were not, in the truest sense, discoverers . . ."

But this explanation is hardly satisfactory. Since she is dealing with the North Pacific coast, which means that portion north of the forty-second parallel, it would have been necessary to describe only the three or four Spanish voyages made subsequent to the occupation of California. These would surely not have required a separate volume if the author had been content to omit the long chapter (more than one-tenth of the book) on Sir Francis Drake (whose voyage has no bearing on North Pacific discovery) and the chapter on Benyowsky, which is equally barren of geographical information.

The inclusion of topics like those just mentioned, at the expense of more legitimate subjects, shows that the author's selections were determined by some test other than the strictly historical; and the reader is left in no doubt as to what this test is. It is perfectly clear that Miss Laut took pains to select a list of highly romantic subjects; and also that she industriously assembled, from the masses of available material, such facts as would enable her to present the most dramatic phases of each subject. In other words, we have here history from which all that is tame or merely commonplace has been carefully expurgated.

This may favor the literary success of the book, but it seriously impairs its value to the historical student. For it cannot be too strongly maintained that the truth of history is violable in the plan of a book just as well as in its execution; and the unwary reader who depends upon this volume for his knowledge of the history of North Pacific exploration will be worse "befogged" than were the early navigators of Alaskan waters, the unnatural principle of selection giving him a wholly false perspective.

In matters of detail the author is fairly accurate; though there are a few errors which argue a lack of familiarity with the best secondary authorities within her field. After making all necessary deductions, it may still be said that the book will furnish to the discriminating student a considerable fund of information not so conveniently accessible elsewhere.

JOSEPH SCHAFER.

*The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898.* Edited by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES A. ROBERTSON. Vol. XXI., 1624. Vol. XXII., 1625-1629. Vol. XXIII., 1629-1630. Vol. XXIV., 1630-1634. Vol. XXV., 1635-1636. Vol. XXVI., 1636. Vol. XXVII., 1636-1637. Vol. XXIX., 1638-1640. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1905. Pp. 320, 323, 297, 340, 322, 315, 366, 315.)

TWELVE volumes of this the most valuable work ever published in Philippine history were issued during 1905, coming down to volume XXXII. Of these, eight volumes are here reviewed, leaving for separate review the appendix on ecclesiastical and religious affairs which occupies most of volume XXVIII. and the history of the Dominicans in the Philippines by Aduarte, occupying half of volume XXX. and the two succeeding volumes.

This series is to consist of fifty-five volumes, hence is considerably more than half completed. Yet it will be noted that we are brought down chronologically only to 1640, leaving half the seventeenth century, all the eighteenth, and all the final century of Spanish rule to be covered in twenty-three volumes, including also the complete index which we are promised. It is true, however, that some of the old works which have been republished in part or wholly in the series thus far have covered not only events of 1565 to 1640, but also to some extent later happenings in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while the ecclesiastical appendix in volume XXVIII. republishes documents summarizing matters of this character down to the close of Spanish rule in the Philippines. This form of treatment by subjects, regardless of strict chronological sequence, may be followed in the succeeding volumes with reference to other than ecclesiastical matters; and it is probably the intention of the editors to deal with the nineteenth century, and to some extent with the eighteenth century, by republishing in translation some of the more important works which are so scarce as virtually to be inaccessible to most students. Nevertheless, the question will arise whether or no too much space has not been given to documents of the conquest period merely, leaving correspondingly less space for the bringing out of hitherto unknown documentary sources upon the really more important periods of Philippine history which follow. These subsequent periods are, moreover, precisely those upon which least light has been shed, apart from certain events and controversies of

a striking character which have monopolized the attention of the so-called historians of the Philippines, who have usually confused rather than cleared up the facts regarding them, while leaving large hiatuses in their treatment of Philippine economic history, administrative policy and mechanism, and the larger questions regarding the social development of the Filipinos.

Volume XXI. is entirely occupied with matters ecclesiastical and religious. Among the five documents of 1624, the one of most importance consists of records from the archives regarding Archbishop Serrano's attempt of 1624 to inspect the Paco parish. The royal decrees, etc., all support the jurisdiction of the ordinary against the claims of the regular orders of exemption from episcopal visitation. Serrano yielded, however; the Audiencia would not back him in the little excommunication war which resulted; and this question was not settled till long after. Two-thirds of the volume are given to reprints in abstracts and translations of portions of the histories of the Recollects by Andrés de San Nicolás (1664), Luis de Jesus (1681), and Juan de la Concepción (1788), and we have facsimiles of these old title-pages. San Nicolás's observations on the customs of the primitive Filipinos are hearsay and often suspicious; Luis de Jesus seems more accurate, though rehearsing hearsay that has come down through a succession of unscientific observers. Precisely the things to be accepted with very great caution are the "wonder-tales" of this sort, which are duplicated over and over again in writings on early Philippine history, and are often solemnly quoted as if they were scientifically established facts. In this same category must be put the relation of the Jesuit Bobadilla (1640), reproduced in volume XXIX. from Thévenot's *Relations* (Paris, 1696).

Volume XXII. contains an array of miscellaneous documents. These cover mostly old ground. The editors have selected from the *Laws of the Indies* decrees regarding the Chinese in the Philippines.

Over half of volume XXIII. and half of volume XXIV. are occupied by the translation, partly in synopsis, of the history of the Augustinian order in the Philippines by Father Juan de Medina. It would have been just as well if space had been saved by much more synopsis; indeed, the whole work might be omitted without loss, especially since, though written in 1630, it was published only in 1893 at Manila. It gives little information not elsewhere obtainable in better form, except for its revelations of quarrels, and even murders, in the Augustinian order at Manila. The note on the increase of Philippine population from the period of the Spanish Conquest to 1903 is drawn in part from an entirely uncritical source, the *United States Philippine Gazetteer* (a document which ought never to have been published). Population statistics in the Philippines require careful scrutiny, both as to source and contents, even to the very last year of Spanish rule. Documents published in earlier volumes of this same series have indicated a larger population for the Philippines at the time of the conquest than has ordinarily been estimated; and in the light of some of these documents the in-

teresting study of early Philippine population by Dr. David P. Barrows in *Census of the Philippine Islands* (Washington, 1905, I. 411-491) will have to be revised. The other half of each of the volumes under consideration (XXIII. and XXIV.) comprises miscellaneous documents, containing a good deal of valuable matter. Incidentally we find Governor-general Tavera saying bluntly in 1629, as regards the probabilities of speculations, that the "offices in the Indies are not worth anything unless one steals" (XXIII. 41). From a number of references in volume XXIII. we discover that the one hundred and thirty lepers sent to Manila by the Mikado of Japan in 1631, an incident which has been given its picturesque version in almost every historical sketch of the Philippines, were not exactly the tribute, sarcastic or otherwise, of a "heathen" to Christian charity, but were in reality Japanese who had been converted to Christianity by some of the missionary fathers whose banishment from Japan had long before been decreed.

Data on commerce and the related subject of Philippine colonial finance make up not only the largest part, but also the most significant part, of the documents in volumes XXV., XXVI., and XXVII. Among these, first place must be assigned to the memorials of Juan Grau y Monfalcón, and especially that of 1637, reproduced in translation in volume XXVII. from a printed copy in the Royal Academy of History in Madrid, collated with later imperfect copies. Despite the author's involved reasoning and wearisome repetitions, this is one of the most important documents of early Philippine history; and we are indebted to the editors for this painstaking and complete version of it in good English. Grau y Monfalcón was appointed by the distressed Spaniards in Manila their procurator before the court at Madrid to represent the declining state of Spanish commerce in the Orient in the face of Dutch and Portuguese aggressions and of the harsh restrictions put upon their trade with America at the behest of the home manufacturers and traders in Spain. In a large degree the other documents of these volumes are corroboratory or supplementary of the procurator's testimony. Incidentally, we gather interesting evidence as to the poor "trading character" of the Spaniards, revealed as well in these early days as later, and being a fact quite as important perhaps as the bad commercial policy of Spain in her colonial career (a colonial policy which was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries quite similar to that of the nations which succeeded as traders). The grievances against the Portuguese in Macao, who were shutting off Chinese trade with Manila and even ousting Spanish merchants on their own ground at Manila, point most plainly to this poor trading character of the latter; for the Portuguese were not only kindred in race, as the Dutch rivals were not, but they were at that time politically subordinate to the crown of Spain. Another reason, apart from questions of national policy, why the Dutch were ousting the Spaniards (who rested in their purely military strongholds) from the control of the East-Indian archipelago, ap-

pears in Governor-general Corcuera's statement (XXVII. 362) that the Spaniard who had for some years held the post of governor of Ternate had amassed there a fortune of \$400,000 (and less perhaps by unlawful private trading than by abuse of the military funds and authority given to him).

Grau y Monfalcón and the various supplementary data in other documents give pretty full explanation regarding the amount and value of the Manila-Acapulco galleon-trade, and details as to its conduct, the tariff system, the trade restrictions, etc. Incidentally, in connection with the detailed information about Philippine revenues and expenditures, we are shown also what was Spain's military establishment in the Philippines and the Orient generally. This is a very closely related subject, for the Philippine budget included also the establishments in the Moluccas and Formosa. Hence, while we here have plain proof that the Philippine revenues proper (exclusive of some \$300,000 collected in galleon duties at Acapulco) produced at this time only about \$250,000 of the \$850,000 spent from Manila, and \$250,000 to \$300,000 had to be sent annually as a subsidy from the treasury of Mexico, yet Grau y Monfalcón figures the annual cost of the Moluccan and Formosan establishments to be more than the subsidy. Moreover, in years just previous, large expeditions for East-Indian conquest had been fitted out in the Philippines, the money cost falling in part upon adventurers hoping for returns and upon Manila merchants who advanced loans, while in still larger degree the burden fell upon the Filipinos, among whom forced labor was levied, while the more convenient Philippine forests were devastated. The Manila treasury accounts, too, show frauds perpetrated and favoritism extended at the expense of the interests of the royal estate, especially when the vigorous Governor-general Corcuera proceeds to turn things upside down in Manila. He informs the king that Formosa, where a Spanish post was established in 1626, is of no value to Spain, and that the people are too wild to convert. The galleon-trade, restricted to \$500,000 annually, is by many persons testified to mount by secret evasions and official collusion to three or four times that amount; yet the Mexican and Portuguese merchants who encroach upon it, and the Chinese retailers who are too clever for the Spanish traders in Manila, have been getting so much the better of the latter in reaping these illegal profits that Manila is commercially flat upon its back in 1636 and 1637, and the galleon-trade is for the time practically suspended. With all this, the old religio-commercial arguments are still held before the king, he is urged to see that Manila is "the key to the commerce of the Orient", and that if he does not regain and retain power in the Orient, the Dutch and English will press still more disastrously upon his commerce and outposts in the West Indies and the Atlantic Ocean.

The quarrel between Governor-general Corcuera and Archbishop Guerrero occupies the second half of volume XXV. and much of volume XXVI., while echoes of it are heard in volumes XXVII. and XXIX. There is necessarily much repetition, and condensation or

omission of some of the documents could be recommended, though it is all interesting. There are many complicating side-issues; for the Jesuits array themselves with the civil authority, and the friar orders with the archbishop. (In some of the phases of this quarrel, one would be inclined to put it the other way and say that the archbishop took up the cause of the monastic orders, and the governor-general that of the Jesuits; the governor-general was, however, a most independent character, while the archbishop seems to have been rather the tool of others.) Of this quarrel, which grew out of several incidents and involved some spectacular occurrences in the way of violation of sanctuary, a contest of military power with excommunications, a deluge of interdicts from civil and ecclesiastical courts, street brawls between Spaniards with swords and Spaniards with gowns, and finally the banishment of the old archbishop to Mariveles island at the mouth of Manila Bay, the real cause was the independent character of Corcuera himself. He made most vigorous and bitter representations to the king of the determination of the religious orders to rule or to undermine the authority of any governor-general who would not be ruled by them. Partly as a result of this, we find a decided trend toward secularization of Philippine parishes on the part of the Spanish court at this time. But neither this nor the issue involved as to the relative powers of archbishop and governor-general in the control of the royal patronage of religion in the Philippines was definitely decided at this time, as later history shows. There were then far more Spanish secular priests in the Philippines than there were at any time in the nineteenth century, and particularly in its latter half; and in the seventeenth century half-caste sons of Spanish fathers were being ordained as secular priests and admitted to the religious orders.

In an interesting tabulation whereby Corcuera's auditor shows recent frauds in the Manila treasury (XXVI. 152, 172-193), we note evidence (pp. 177-178, 192) that the wages allowed from the royal treasury for the pay of natives forced to work on the churches and convents were collected by the heads of the religious orders for which the work was done, who thus probably received double aid from the king's funds. Despite the abuses of forced labor during twoscore preceding years, the faithful services of the native soldiers, especially the Pampangans, but also the Tagalogs and Bikols, were highly praised by Corcuera and Grau y Monfalcón (XXV. 148, XXVI. 197, 202, 206-208), the latter saying: "Not one of those Indians has ever been found in rebellion, or has wrought any treachery, or deserted to the enemy" (XXV. 148). He recommends that some natives be made officers. We find also that Filipino soldiers, sailors, arsenal workmen, and other mechanics were deemed worth half as much pay as Spaniards in the same places. Corcuera's conquests in Mindanao and Joló (1635-1638) were in considerable degree dependent upon the loyalty and fighting qualities of his Pampangan regiments.



These campaigns are related in various documents in volumes XXVII. and XXIX., notably in letters of Jesuit chroniclers, who, as their order was specially favored by Corcuera, were not at all lax in glorifying him. The completion of the old fort at Samboanga (which still stands) dates from this time, and the Spaniards then first entered the Lake Lanao region, though Corcuera's principal campaigns were in the Cotabato district of Mindanao and on the island of Joló. Corcuera's disregard for law or precedent in his innovating course at Manila is brought out in the jealous charges of Admiral Bañuelos y Carrillo, in a protest from the royal treasurer, and in several decrees of the king. From the many documents of this volume (XXIX.), which is one of the most usefully edited of the series thus far, we get information principally along the following lines: (1) the conflicts between the regular and the secular clergy; (2) the abuse of the natives by Spaniards of both religious and lay estates; (3) the existence in the Philippines of negro slavery in some degree, and the extension of such slavery to the captured Moros, some also being sent to the galleys; (4) the Spanish policy of reprisal and retaliation upon the Moros after the Moros' own fashions, making it on both sides a sort of piratical, bushwhacking warfare which led to no permanent results but increase of mutual hatred and distrust; and (5) the low commercial status of Spanish power in the Orient. We have also in this volume a most interesting anonymous but contemporaneous document describing the Chinese revolt and ensuing massacres of 1639-1640. It appears that this was due to the suspension of the galleon-trade and hence loss of Chinese profits in Manila, the higher taxation of Chinese under Corcuera, and the compulsory measures taken by him to construct by Chinese labor a great royal rice-estate in what were then swamps around Calamba on the Laguna de Bay (estates which the Dominicans afterward obtained, forming part of the land lately sold by them to the Philippine government), malarial diseases decimating the Chinese laborers. On the Spanish side, we are told, the number killed during some three months of disturbances was forty-five Spaniards and three hundred Filipino soldiers, while the execution among the Chinese pike-bearers and spear-bearers, including also flocks of unarmed or disarmed Chinese massacred by official orders, was 22,000 to 24,000, leaving some 8,000 Chinese who finally surrendered.

In the eight volumes just under consideration, ninety documents (many of them made up of separate parts, such as Spanish royal decrees collected by subjects) are produced in translation, as are parts or the whole of seven old printed works. The editorial work upon these documents shows painstaking care and much discrimination (except for the queries raised above as to the space-value of some of the documents, in spite of the interest they possess); the translations—and this is important—appear generally to deserve the same commendation. The illustrations are all good, and some of the old plates reproduced are pertinent and valuable, *e. g.*, the Portuguese Berthelot's map (1635) of



the Philippines, Borneo, and the Celebes, reproduced in volume XXV., pp. 56-57, from an old copy in the British Museum.

JAMES A. LEROY.

*The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut.* By M. LOUISE GREENE, Ph.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1905. Pp. xiii, 552.)

MISS GREENE has been fortunate in her theme, the gradual broadening and liberalizing of religion in a community where religion has always been of vital interest to the great majority of the population. She has also been most fortunate in the locality in which she was privileged to pursue her studies. Her careful and scholarly treatise bears plain evidence, not only of the abundant material that she has utilized out of the rich accumulations of the Yale Library, but also of the judicious spirit and wise counsels of the distinguished group of historical scholars to whom in her introduction she acknowledges her indebtedness. The city of New Haven, and Yale University itself, are monuments that illustrate the author's theme on every page of their history. Few places in New England could furnish worse examples of religious intolerance in the past; certainly there are none that can surpass them at the present day in the appreciation of an enlightened liberty.

The familiar facts in the introductory chapters upon Puritanism and New England Congregationalism are restated clearly and moderately and without prejudice. The services of the founders of the Connecticut colony to religious liberty at the very outset of its history are noticed and appreciated. The events which led to the adoption of a semi-Presbyterian system of government in the Saybrook Platform are carefully traced and recorded. The extremely interesting and significant story of the growth on Connecticut soil of the Episcopal church, and the startling episode of the declaration of the rector and tutors of Yale College that they intended to seek Episcopal ordination (a revolution that alarmed the whole of New England), are treated with great judgment and care. Connecticut men whose memories go back for only fifty years will recall anecdotes and traditions that they heard in their boyhood that show how bitter and how lasting was the feeling then engendered. It is not the least of Miss Greene's successes that she has discussed this subject with such impartiality.

The most interesting chapter in the religious history of Connecticut, the story of "The Great Awakening", is treated by Miss Greene with great judgment and impartiality. Her interest in it is religious and psychological rather than theological, and, though she explains the mysteries of the Edwardsian and Hopkinsian systems, she dwells, rightly, less on the doctrines discussed than upon the results of the movement on the religious and political life of the community.

With the same colorless impartiality, admirable as it is unusual, the author relates the disagreeable history of the earlier years of the nineteenth century, when union of religious and political privilege took

the place of the former nobler union of church and state, until the forces of liberalism burst their bonds and overthrew at once the Federalist party and the "Standing Order". The desire for a government founded upon the will of the people rather than on the charter of Charles II., joined with a demand for religious liberty and equality, brought on the peaceful revolution of 1818, which restored once more the principles that had inspired the early founders of the commonwealth in their contest for religious and political liberty.

Miss Greene has chosen an important though difficult subject; and her treatment of it will encourage many who have long dismissed the history of platforms and covenants, ecclesiastical discussions and dissensions, as hopelessly arid and jejune, to renew their acquaintance with them as steps in the development of religious liberty in the steadiest and most sober-minded of any of our early commonwealths.

*American Political History, 1763-1876.* By ALEXANDER JOHNSTON. Edited and supplemented by JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1905. Two vols., pp. ix, 446; iv, 598.)

NEARLY a quarter of a century ago Professor Johnston of Princeton University contributed to Lalor's *Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and of the Political History of the United States* a series of articles upon various topics in American history and government. These have now been collected by Professor Woodburn, rearranged in order, furnished with sundry additions to fill gaps, and equipped with recent bibliographical references, and are presented as a political history of the United States. On the whole, this was a task well worth doing, since these cyclopædia articles stand almost unrivalled for compactness and clearness, an excellent example of that "histoire explicative", as Seignobos calls it, which discards all extraneous matter and reduces the text to the concentrated analysis of what was significant and permanent in events. The acumen and lucidity with which such subjects are handled as the organization of the federal government, the conduct of party affairs in Congress, the process of secession, and the steps in reconstruction will make the book of unquestionable utility for the student and teacher.

There are certain drawbacks, however, resulting from the topical nature of the material, which impair the perfection of the work, and are not remedied even by the editor's additions, pertinent and useful as these generally are. Since Professor Johnston dealt, naturally, with each subject in all its ramifications, the reprinting together of the separate articles leads to an amount of repetition and a dislocation of chronology which almost destroys unity. When the history of each party and of several aspects of federal activity are studied under such heads as states' rights, secession, etc., the same events reappear in substantially identical form in half a dozen distinct places. On the other hand, subjects which

naturally belong together are widely divided. The chapter on the Constitutional Convention of 1787 does not describe the great compromises, which are left to be dealt with in another chapter in a different volume. The events of Jackson's terms are considered long before the origin of the Democratic party is studied, and the entire history of the Republican party precedes that of the Whigs or Free-soilers. It certainly seems as if the editor might have made a far better piece of work had he taken the liberty of discarding much repetitious matter, dividing long topics, and adhering with some pretense at closeness to chronological order. The cross-references with which the editor makes an attempt to remedy confusion are unfortunately without page numbers, and the index is scanty and contains errors. As it stands the book is hard to use, especially the second volume, and can scarcely be handled except by such as are already familiar with United States history. The narrowly political standpoint of the author gives the work an old-fashioned air.

Another peculiarity which stands out in the collected essays is the fact that they were nearly all written to prove certain favorite theses of the author, whose youth was passed in the crisis of the Rebellion and the Reconstruction struggle and whose opinions are plainly tinged with the feelings of those times. He maintains throughout, with great fervor, the fundamentally national character of the United States, combating the arguments of the states' rights school and showing impatience with the early statesmen for not realizing and asserting his principles. The establishment of the Articles of Confederation he terms a "usurpation" of sovereignty by the states, and of the Articles themselves he says (I. 60) "it is difficult, to speak temperately". This assertion of national sovereignty runs through the discussion of every controverted constitutional question, giving the work a distinctly polemic character.

A similar theoretical tendency betrays itself in the treatment of political parties, which he regards as founded purely on opinion. "On this fundamental question of a strict or a broad construction of the Constitution", he says, "all legitimate national party differences in the United States are and always have been based" (II. 225). The persistence with which the author, standing upon this superficial criterion of parties, criticizes leaders and followers for their departures from "proper" views is only atoned for by the real keenness he displays when, neglecting theoretical tests, he devotes himself to the task of interpreting political and party action as it actually took place. Throughout the last part of the work the Southern and Democratic elements receive unsympathetic treatment, and a strong tendency is manifested to justify all acts of the Republican party. Nevertheless the author makes few mistakes and these are mostly in the line of vague or sweeping statements. It is old-fashioned, for instance, to call Hutchinson "unscrupulous" while applying no epithet to his rival Sam Adams; or to class the North Carolina Regulators with the destroyers of the Gaspee. The North Carolina and Virginia electors who voted for Adams in 1796 did not do so from "whim", but because they were elected in Federalist districts; Birney

did not decline the Liberty nomination in 1840; the "great mass" of Southern Whigs were not driven into the Democratic party by the Kansas-Nebraska Bill; Maryland was far from "permanently Democratic" after 1852. The strong point of the essays lies in the clearness and vigor with which political action and motives are analyzed, and for this reason the volumes, in spite of their chaotic character, will be of permanent value.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

*The Life of Oliver Ellsworth.* By WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.  
(New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1905. Pp. xi, 369.)

A TRUSTWORTHY and well-written life of Ellsworth is a book worth having, and this life has both of these qualities. I cannot venture to say that it is absolutely free from error, for I have not scrupulously sought for blunders; but those I have noticed are trivial. The book is well written because the English style is clear, straightforward, and simple, not over-elaborated or striving for effect.

There has for a time been a supposition that the Ellsworth descendants had in their possession valuable manuscripts bearing on the life of the statesman, but, though Mr. Brown had access to everything, not much was found. One or two manuscript biographies of Ellsworth, written by relatives, and quite as dangerous in their temptations as helpful in their guidance, and a very few unpublished letters of not much significance were all the family treasures he unearthed. One of these manuscript biographies, which was written by Ellsworth's son-in-law, Joseph Wood, appears to have been used by Flanders. The other, the work of the Reverend Abner Jackson, sometime president of Hobart College, who married a granddaughter of the chief justice, has not, Mr. Brown says, been used before. Still these unpublished works were not very important; to have in one's possession the manuscript of a previous writer who tells of things that cannot be substantiated is embarrassing to a conscientious biographer, and there is evidence that Mr. Brown, burdened with at least sufficient courtesy, was at times puzzled in deciding how far he should be influenced by the efforts of his predecessors. He has not infrequently given rumor and hearsay for what they are worth, which may have been wise; but he rarely if ever speaks with a tone of certainty about any fact not fairly well supported by good evidence. More frequently than is desirable he has had to rely on the unsupported statements of Flanders and Van Santvoord. The material on which he had to depend was in no small measure in print—the *Trumbull Papers*, the *Journals of Congress*, the published *Writings* of the statesmen of the time, Maclay's *Journal*, and like sources. There is no indication that the manuscript journals of the Old Congress were ransacked, but it must be said that in all probability the most that could possibly have been gained by this drudgery would have been the discovery of a few formal details.

Considering the limitations under which the author worked, the reviewer must say that he has produced a good book. We would fain know more of the really critical periods in Ellsworth's life: his work in the Convention of 1787; his ideas of the scope and significance of the Judiciary Act; his experience in France in framing the convention of 1800. But these periods are sanely treated, and I imagine we must rest content. Whatever may be the judgment of the reader on this point, one conclusion he will be forced to reach: he will be compelled to admire the skill with which the story is told and to acknowledge that now Ellsworth comes before us a living personality. This is no small achievement for a biographer. For many of us, at least, Ellsworth has been brought out of a hazy background of impersonalness; from being a mere advocate of measures he has become a man and an impressive one. Moreover, I feel confident, the author has estimated aright the character of his subject; it is not likely that future studies will seriously impair the portrait or demand important revision of judgments.

It is not perfectly plain that the author has properly weighed the influence of Ellsworth in one essential and most significant particular—I mean his influence in framing that important clause in the plan of the Small State Party which declared that the Constitution should be the supreme law of the land, the clause which afterward, somewhat modified, became one of the cardinal clauses of the Constitution, and which was the basis in part for the Judiciary Act of 1789, the "Constitution" of the judiciary. I say it is not perfectly plain, because much must rest on conjecture; and yet when one considers the make-up of the Small State Party, remembers that Ellsworth, Luther Martin, and Paterson were fellow-members of the same club while students at Princeton, notices that Martin moved the insertion of this clause in the Constitution, gives heed to the fact that it was Sherman who stated most clearly the fact that an unconstitutional state law would be void and not voidable, gives full weight to the words of Ellsworth in the Connecticut convention (where with a clearness not elsewhere discoverable he defended the new order as one based on law), and when moreover we appreciate, as Mr. Brown has helped us to do, the work of Ellsworth in the establishment of the courts and in securing the passage of the Judiciary Act, we are entitled to a substantial conjecture that Ellsworth was peculiarly responsible for the most striking, perhaps the most important, thing that was done during those days when the institutions of the government were being formed. For it must be noted, of course, that the Revolution and the formation of the Constitution resulted in the establishment of a new kind of imperial state, based upon a new idea, built upon law and not like the old—or the new—empire of England based upon opportunism. This it is that is the most distinguishing trait of the American constitutional system; and any combination of facts that, even by conjecture, will enable us in the smallest measure to lift the process of its creation out of the gloom of uncertainty is a combination worth presenting. Certainly Mr. Brown has not seen quite face to

face the relation between the second clause of article vi. of the Constitution on the one hand (which had its origin, as far as the Convention was concerned, in the work of the Small State Party), and the Judiciary Act on the other.

In dealing with Ellsworth's speeches in the Convention the author has followed Bancroft's method, collating all the reports to be found. This is of doubtful propriety. To be sure we do not know just what Ellsworth said; but we do know what Madison and Yates reported that he said, and the quotation marks are properly used to indicate these reports. The modern historical student has a natural and deeply-rooted objection to any acceptance of Bancroft's methods in handling quotations, even where as in this instance the results are not serious.

The book appears to me in most respects to estimate rightly the work and influence of the Connecticut men in the Convention. It points out clearly that, while Ellsworth desired to preserve the states, he was not unfavorable to a national government; and it does not leave the impression that the great compromise meant the establishment of a confederation of sovereign states. Thoughtlessly, however, the author falls into the trap set in Madison's notes, June 15, and classifies Connecticut with New York. The truth is that the Connecticut trio differed so much from Lansing and Yates, and from Paterson of New Jersey, that we are tempted to doubt whether the former delegation took any part in the formation of the Small State plan, despite much testimony as to their participation (Madison's notes, June 15; Martin's *Genuine Information*, in Elliot, I. 349). To the following statement, also, one might make objection: "Ellsworth, however, declared: 'The United States are sovereign on one side of the line dividing their jurisdiction—the states on the other. Each ought to have power to defend their respective sovereignties.' These were words, one fancies, from which comfort might have been drawn by the planners of a New England Confederacy two-score years later, and by the builders of the Southern Confederacy" (p. 163). The subject under consideration was treason; to announce that a state must have the right to punish treason against itself and that it retains a portion of sovereignty certainly gives no comfort to the builders of Confederacy, which was founded on the doctrine of indivisible sovereignty.

A. C. McLAUGHLIN.

*American Diplomacy: its Spirit and Achievements.* By JOHN BASSETT MOORE, LL.D., Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1905. Pp. xii, 286.)

*Historia de la Diplomacia Americana: Política Internacional de los Estados Unidos.* Por MARTIN GARCÍA MÉROU, Enviado Extraordinario y Ministro Plenipotenciario de la República Argentina. (Buenos Aires: Félix Lajouane y Ca. 1904. Pp. xxix, 398; xxviii, 515.)

THESE two works are at once an evidence and a result of the growing interest, at home and abroad, in the public policy and achievements of the United States. They are written from widely different standpoints and with different ends in view, but each fulfils well the purpose for which it was written. Both writers have established reputations as publicists and each has had practical experience in the diplomatic service of his country.

Moore's book, which is divided into ten chapters, is in the main a reproduction of a series of articles that appeared in *Harper's Magazine*. It is a sketch, rather than a chronological narrative, of American diplomacy. The author adopts the topical method and has shown admirable judgment in the selection of those subjects which illustrate the principles and distinctive purposes of our foreign policy. In attempting to compress within the brief space of three hundred pages a sketch of American diplomacy from its beginnings in the Revolutionary epoch to its present-day tendencies, many important matters have of necessity been omitted and many others passed over briefly; but even in those topics which have been treated more fully by other writers, such as the system of neutrality, the freedom of the seas, the fisheries, and the Monroe doctrine, Mr. Moore clears up many misapprehensions and writes with a precision and clearness of judgment to which few writers can lay claim. This fact is all that redeems the book from the combined faults of brevity and comprehensiveness; for, although this is a very unusual charge to bring, the author has erred in this direction.

Mr. Moore is, apparently, in thorough sympathy with the present tendencies of our foreign policy. He denies emphatically (p. iii) "that the United States has, as the result of certain changes in its habits, suddenly become, within the past few years, 'a world-power.' The United States has in reality always been, in the fullest and highest sense, a world-power." While this view will probably be admitted by the majority of students of American diplomacy as substantially correct, it does not disguise the fact that we have in recent years entered upon a new era of policy and made some radical departures. There is undoubtedly a tendency in Mr. Moore's book to minimize the radicalness of the change, and in one or two instances he is apparently reading into the past the views of the present. He at least lays himself open to this criticism in the following statement found on page 224. In discussing France's renunciation, in the treaty of 1778, of all designs on the remaining possessions of Great Britain in North America and the provision that if they should be wrested from the mother-country, they were to be "confederated with or dependent upon" the United States, he says: "in harmony with this stipulation, provision was made in the Articles of Confederation (Article xi.) for the full admission of Canada into the Union. No other colony was to be so admitted without the consent of nine States; and unless they consented, the colony, if seized, was to remain in a 'dependent' position." The clause which I have italicized does not occur in the Articles of Confederation, as might be supposed



from the context, and can hardly be considered a valid inference even when the article referred to is taken in conjunction with the clause quoted from the treaty.

Throughout the volume Mr. Moore speaks with the authority derived from a thorough mastery of the sources, and with a refreshing disregard of views that have gained currency through mere force of repetition. His general treatment is free from conventional bias. The volume has a short bibliography and an index, but no foot-notes. Only two typographical errors were noted: possession for possessions (p. 224) and Summer for Sumner (p. 270).

Mérou's *Historia de la Diplomacia Americana*, which covers the same period, is, in striking contrast with the above, a chronological narrative. It is the fullest attempt yet made to cover in a single treatise the entire diplomatic history of the United States. There is five times as much reading-matter in Mérou as in Moore, and nearly two and a half times as much as in Foster. The work is subject to two limitations: in the first place, it was written for South-Americans with the aim of giving the rising generation an adequate idea of the place and importance of the United States in world politics; and in the second place, the author felt constrained by his official position as Argentine minister at Washington to refrain from passing criticism or judgment on the events recorded. The work is by no means however a colorless narrative of events, for while the author refrains as a general rule from expressing his own opinions, he quotes at length the opinions of American writers, without, however, always subjecting them to a critical analysis or to the test of a comparison with the sources. Parts of the work are indeed based on sources, and the writer seems familiar with all the more important ones; but too frequently he follows the lead of some one authority whose views he adopts for the topic he is discussing. For example, in discussing the annexation of Texas (II. 21-22) he quotes from Foster's *A Century of American Diplomacy*, p. 321, the opinion of General Grant that "The occupation, separation, and annexation [of Texas] were, from the inception of the movement to its final consummation, a conspiracy to acquire territory out of which slave States might be formed for the American Union." In striking contrast with this opinion, Moore (p. 234) says: "By a school of writers whose views have had great currency, the annexation has been denounced as the result of a plot of the slave-power to extend its dominions. But, calmly surveying the course of American expansion, we are forced to conclude that no illusion could be more complete. It would be more nearly correct to say that, but for the controversy concerning slavery, there would have been no appreciable opposition in the United States to the acquisition of Texas."

Again, in discussing the purchase of Alaska Mérou (II. 129) gives expression to the oft-repeated view that the United States paid the purchase-money to Russia for a territory then deemed of little or no value out of gratitude for Russia's friendly naval demonstration in American waters during the Civil War when the intervention of England and



France was feared. Moore, on the other hand, referring to the same view, says: "This explanation may be placed in the category of the grotesque" (p. 236).

In Mérou's references to American politics he sometimes falls into more or less serious errors. For instance, the terms of the Missouri Compromise (I. 245), of the Wilmot Proviso, and of the Compromise of 1850 (II. 80) are inaccurately stated.

The author's attitude is sympathetic, and he writes in a spirit of undisguised admiration of "la gran República". Considerable space is devoted to Pan-American diplomacy, but the American reader cannot but wish that the writer had given us a comprehensive discussion from his standpoint of the primacy of the United States in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. In the introductory pages of the first volume he does, indeed, have something to say of the influence of the United States in Central America and in Mexico. He says that in the Central-American states there exists a clearly defined sentiment favorable to annexation to the United States. In Mexico, while American influence is less felt in the political field, it is even stronger in the field of commerce and finance. The opening of the canal, he thinks, is destined to produce fundamental transformations in the political and economic organization of all these nations (I. 6). As to our relations with the countries farther south he has little to say.

In discussing President Roosevelt's canal policy, the author departs from his usual rule and gives expression to his views. While stating that the recognition of Panama establishes an offensive precedent, he nevertheless justifies the action of the American Executive on the ground of Colombia's inability to maintain order. His argument is largely a restatement of the case as presented in the President's message.

The volumes are equipped with appendixes, containing a short bibliography and documents, occasional foot-notes, and quite full references at the end of some of the chapters. The style is clear and interesting, and while the amount of positive contribution is not great, this work is the most complete narrative of American diplomacy that has yet been written.

JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ.

*The Constitutional Decisions of John Marshall.* Edited, with an introductory essay, by JOSEPH P. COTTON, Jr. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1905. Two vols., pp. xxxvi, 462; v, 464.)

THE editor of these volumes has performed a useful task in a satisfactory manner. We have here in convenient form the opinions of Marshall, which in themselves constitute so large a part of the constitutional history of the United States. There is a general introduction, and each decision is introduced by an ample note setting forth the historical circumstances in which the case arose, and indicating with precision, without undue technicality of expression, the significance of the principles in the development of American law. Nowhere else is the ser-

vice of Marshall so clearly presented, and nowhere else do we find such a plain and simple tale of the progress of the court and the importance of its decisions in the first thirty-five years of the last century. "Plain" and "simple" may seem strange words to use in connection with a subject like constitutional law; but Marshall's own decisions are so lucid, and the annotations of the editor so clever and sound, that the words are not altogether inappropriate.

It is not impossible to find fault with some of the statements of the editor or with his point of view. One may doubt whether he has sufficiently studied the antecedents of the Convention's work, which resulted in the establishment of the Constitution as the law of the land and in giving to the federal judiciary cognizance of controversies arising under the Constitution. While the case of *Marbury v. Madison* is striking and epochal, it is not difficult, by dwelling on its unexpectedness, to leave the impression that Marshall's decision came from a clear sky and was without historical preparation. It would have been better if the author had shown, if only in outline, the long course of historical development which made the decision natural as well as logically a sound part of American constitutional law. Certainly we should have been given a statement of the principles of *Commonwealth v. Caton*, *Holmes v. Walton*, *Bayard v. Singleton*, *Trevett v. Weeden*, and a fuller and wiser treatment of the extent to which the functions of the courts were considered and appreciated by the men that framed the Constitution. The uninformed reader may easily be misled by the editor's methods in this particular.

One is also startled to find, in the note preceding *Osborn v. Bank of the United States*, the assertion that with *Cohens v. Virginia* and *McCulloch v. Maryland* and the *Osborn* case "Marshall had practically destroyed the immunity from suit which the Eleventh Amendment had granted" (II. 86). Of course the editor does not mean that, even if he does say so; but unfortunately those who use the books may believe what he says. If he is going into that subject, might it not be well to refer to *Hans v. Louisiana*? And might it not be well also to bring out the profound importance of the doctrine that an unconstitutional law cannot protect a state officer or any officer? Assuredly there is no more important doctrine in the whole realm of law than this portion of the old saying that the king can do no wrong—that each person, no matter how august the authority behind him, is responsible for his own torts. If an editor is seeking to trace the development of the really influential principles through these thirty-five years, it appears that this principle should have received attention.

The consideration of the *Dartmouth College* case is forcible and able, but there is one curious minor error, which at the best leaves an unpleasant impression on the mind of one that knows the facts. The case of *Munn v. Illinois* ought not to be cited (I. 349) as illustration of the doctrine that in spite of charter contract the legislature can control the operation of corporations engaged in public or quasi-public callings.

It is true that the principle of this case is applicable to the control of corporations whose business is "affected with a public interest"; Munn was not however a corporation but a person, and the significance of the decision rests not on the fact that a corporation can be controlled, but that a new set of businesses are subjected to public regulation. The error is possibly trivial, but the statement of the principle is not made with such exactness as to preclude misunderstanding.

Possibly it is not unjust to dissent in some measure to the editor's comment on *Gibbons v. Ogden*, though here again the fault, if there be one, arises from a failure to state with perfect clearness some of the principles involved. Indeed the subject is so difficult that a longer and more explicit statement seems to be imperatively demanded. Nor is it quite certain that Marshall's decision in that case was not absolutely sound, especially those portions referring to the exclusiveness of the power in Congress to regulate interstate commerce. Does the doctrine of concurrent power, the power in the state to legislate on local matters even though the legislation may in some manner affect interstate commerce, really run counter at all to the fundamental propositions of Marshall's decision? Does it anywhere appear that such power of regulation as the states possess does not flow from the undoubted reserved rights of the states—from their power to control local commerce and their police power? The extent to which in the exercise of this reserved power they may be allowed to encroach upon the sphere of interstate commerce is necessarily a matter for particular rather than general determination. The editor's short introductory note appears to declare that the doctrine of concurrent power is in actual if not in nominal opposition to Marshall's opinion.

A. C. McLAUGHLIN.

*The Life and Speeches of Thomas Williams, Orator, Statesman and Jurist, 1806-1872, a Founder of the Whig and Republican Parties.* By BURTON ALVA KONKLE. (Philadelphia: Campion and Company. 1905. Pp. ix, 393; iii, 395-757.)

THOMAS WILLIAMS was superabundantly endowed with a fatal facility for rhetorical speech—a gift nourished and tended with most assiduous care by relatives, teachers, comrades, and friends, who appeared to regard it as a pearl of great price. He may be said to have lisped in figures of speech. "The Professor of Oratory", so writes the youth to his father, "paid me the highest compliment on my last [oration] which has ever been paid to any student"; subjoining the information that he himself has "the reputation of being the best composer that Dickinson College has produced since its revival" (p. 30). He studies law with (as our author states) "a brilliant and cultured bachelor lawyer . . . strong and oratorical—even ornate" (p. 34). His chum, left behind at college, writes him that his "pieces" are being spoken "in the prayer-hall" (p. 35).

Consequently, when this young Roscius steps upon the stage of active life, he is ready to orate on any and all occasions, and revels in

every opportunity. His biography becomes a series of "splendid" orations connected by the merest thread of narrative. First comes "His Notable Eulogy" on President Harrison. Then follows the "Tariff Address" of the Clay campaign of 1844. On the election of Polk, he abandons politics to devote himself to his profession. The interval of ten years that followed, according to the arrangement of the book before us, appears to have been taken up with the preparation of a pamphlet attacking an opinion of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania affirming the validity of the acts authorizing subscriptions by municipal corporations to the stock of railroad corporations; for it occupies virtually the whole of the chapter of seventy pages treating of this period. However, it did not convert the court, for that tribunal finally forced the payment of the tax levied to pay the interest on the bonds by *mandamus*, and by so doing provoked another "scathing" review from Williams. This bitter conflict with the judiciary of his own state was, in all probability, the cause of his distrust of the Supreme Court of the United States in the days of Reconstruction—a distrust which led him to advocate on the floor of the House of Representatives so extreme a remedy as requiring unanimity among the judges to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional (see speech, II. 653 *et seqq.*).

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise summoned Williams from his retirement, and he played an influential part in organizing the Republican party in his state and in the conduct of its first presidential campaign. The decisive struggle of 1860 was signalized by a "Notable Address" on "The Negro in American Politics". One "lofty period" of the peroration is all we have room for: "There is no star in that glorious galaxy that shall perish, but planet after planet, won from chaos by the indomitable energies of *free labor*, shall wheel into our system, until our shield is powdered with stars, and the loftiest of the Cordilleras, seated on his throne of rocks, and soaring, with his snow-crowned diadem, away into the summer heavens, shall, in the language of the poet,

'—o'er earth, ocean, wave,

Glare, with his Titan eye, and see no slave!'" (II. 430).

The orator was elected a member of the lower house of the Pennsylvania legislature, and, on the meeting of that body (South Carolina having already seceded), he delivered a "Notable Speech" on "the Maintenance of the Constitution and the Union", which drew from one of his opponents the acknowledgment that he "was overwhelmingly powerful in oratory" (II. 450). In the fall of 1862 he was chosen a representative in the Thirty-eighth Congress, and, on the meeting of that body, emerged at last into national prominence.

His six years in Congress, according to his biographer, were distinguished by four "great speeches", all of which are given in full: one on "restoration", read in the House in April, 1864, which Judge Grier wrote to him was "the best of the season or that has ever been made on the subject with a spice perhaps too much of *spread eaglesism*" (II.

522); another, a "Notable Eulogy" on Lincoln, delivered in Pittsburgh, which Arnold, the friend and biographer of its subject, called "a grand lyric", and confessed that he read the peroration "amidst blinding tears" (II. 553); a third, on "Reconstruction", delivered in the House in 1866 (covering sixty-two pages of the book); and a fourth, his "Great Final Argument", as one of the managers of the impeachment of President Johnson, which was followed by the invariable avalanche of praise.

Nevertheless, we venture the prediction that Thomas Williams will not be remembered on account of his "notable orations". Despite "the lofty march of their periods", they no longer have any real life. He will be remembered, if remembered at all, not for what he said, but for what he did: for the leading part he took in the enactment of the short-lived Tenure-of-Office Act which furnished at last the pretext for the impeachment he had advocated, with all the fiery rhetoric at his command and on more substantial grounds, but until then without success; and, more particularly, for his share in the concoction of its famous proviso, which in the end, to the deep discomfiture of its contrivers, made possible the acquittal of the object of so much Ciceronian invective.

DAVID MILLER DEWITT.

*A History of the Civil War in the United States, 1861-5.* By Lieutenant W. BIRKBECK WOOD, M.A., and Major J. E. EDMONDS, R.E., with an introduction by SPENSER WILKINSON. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Methuen and Company. 1905. Pp. xxii, 549, with thirteen maps and eleven plans.)

THIS book, written by English military men, presumably young (since they describe themselves in the preface as attending recent lectures at the Staff College), is plainly the work of well-educated soldiers. It appears to be especially intended for the use of cadets. Though not so technical as to embarrass the general reader, the book is strictly military, making no further reference to matters civil and political than is necessary to a good understanding of the campaigns. It does not appear that the authors have made a personal study of the fields they describe, or, indeed, that they have ever visited America. The list of authorities to which they refer is rather meagre in view of the extent of the literature relating to the Civil War. Yet the authorities are excellent and have been carefully studied. There is no lack of intelligent comprehension of the events described, and the presentment is simple and direct.

By an odd dislocation the accounts of naval operations are given in a single chapter at the end of the book, the main narrative of events containing the scantiest possible mention of the work of the fleets. In the opinion of many men, both North and South, the navy was even more effective than the army in crushing the Confederacy. Its work was at any rate in the highest degree important, and to relegate the

record of it to the background is ungracious and inappropriate. In many actions of the war the operations of army and navy were intertwined like two strands of the same rope, and cannot be separated in the telling without violence. It is hard to account for so singular an arrangement, unless we take it that the authors, having in view as readers army men, felt that the navy might be postponed as having inferior interest.

In the history of our Civil War there are many points upon which men, whether critics or participants, have never agreed, and perhaps never will agree. Messrs. Wood and Edmonds judge without fear or favor as to the merits of commanders and give chapter and verse for their conclusions. In some of these we do not coincide, but shall take up here but one case. The Seven Days' campaign of 1862 before Richmond is described as "of immense value to the Confederate cause, because it established on a sure basis Lee's reputation as a commander in the field" (p. 80). Set over against this statement that of "Dick" Taylor, a Confederate lieutenant-general, an able soldier, a participant in the campaign, and a devoted friend of Lee. In his *Destruction and Reconstruction* (1879) occurs the statement (p. 86) that the Seven Days' campaign from Mechanicsville to Malvern Hill inclusive "was nothing but a series of blunders, one after another, and all huge".

Since McClellan was kept out of Richmond, the campaign in general must be held to have resulted in favor of the Confederates. But examining the details we find on their side much shortcoming. There was little disparity of numbers between the two sides. Of the series of great battles, but one, Gaines's Mill, was a victory for Lee; all the rest were distinctly defeats. Messrs. Wood and Edmonds repeat the familiar slur, that "Lee read McClellan like an open book" (p. 69). Certainly Lee did not read McClellan when, on June 28, believing that the Federals would retreat down the Peninsula, he detached Ewell's corps and his cavalry under Stuart on a wild-goose chase to the east. Between June 26 and July 1 Lee underwent four defeats: at Savage's Station he failed to embarrass the Federal retreat by Magruder's attack; at Glendale Longstreet and A. P. Hill failed to gain the Quaker road along which the main Federal army retired unassailed. At Mechanicsville and Malvern Hill occurred two of the most disastrous and sanguinary repulses of the entire war. In Lieutenant-general Taylor's opinion these misfortunes were largely due to ignorance on the part of the Confederates of the topography of the country. Though within a few miles of Richmond, neither Lee, nor Johnston before him, had caused it to be explored or mapped; while to the Federals it was accurately known. At the end, though Richmond remained uncaptured, Lee had lost in killed and wounded twice as many as his foe; and but for the inertia of McClellan, who however had shown ability of a high order during his change of base, might have been put to rout.

Of this poor showing for the Confederates Messrs. Wood and Edmonds are well aware, detailing with entire correctness the failures

just described. But how can it be claimed that the Seven Days' campaign established Lee's reputation as a commander? The campaign rather showed that Lee, although bold and brave, had yet much to learn in the handling of a great army. However it may be with poets, generals are made rather than born; or, at any rate, to the natural gift experience must be added in order to bring to pass the perfect soldier. This seems to have been true even in the case of a genius as marked as Lee. The Seven Days' campaign was 'prentice work, not that of a passed master in the art of war such as he afterward became.

Though one may here and there find fault with the work of Messrs. Wood and Edmonds, the book is nevertheless a good military account of our Civil War—impartial, painstaking, intelligent. The authors claim to be disciples of Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, one of the most capable and best instructed of our recent military critics, and the earlier chapters of the volume passed, before his death, under his review. The writers have sat at his feet to good purpose and do their teacher credit.

J. K. HOSMER.

*James Gillespie Blaine.* By EDWARD STANWOOD. [American Statesmen, Second Series.] (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1905. Pp. ii, 377.)

ONE could wish to find the editor of the second American Statesmen series proposing, as one of its objects, the correction of certain omissions from the first. It is hard to see why a gallery of statesmen which includes Calhoun should leave out Jefferson Davis, why it should include Benton and leave out Stephen A. Douglas, why it should include Charles Francis Adams and leave out Garrison. But one infers from the choice of Blaine for the initial number that the editor of the second series (whose identity, by the way, is not disclosed) means it to deal only with men whose careers belong chiefly to the years since Reconstruction.

To write of Blaine is still to provoke controversy, but it is also to arouse interest—at least, among those readers who can remember what a peculiar place Blaine long held in the affections of thousands of thoroughgoing Republicans, and how peculiarly exasperating some other Americans found him. Mr. Stanwood was perhaps better equipped for the work than any other writer in the country. He knew Blaine well—with an intimacy, it appears, passing that of ordinary friendship—and they were closely connected by marriage. He is himself a Maine man. He is a close student of party history. He is a good Republican. He keeps his faith in the man he writes about—an attitude always conducive to the interest of biography. Yet he excels, on the other hand, in the kind of fairness that consists in treating respectfully the men and views one opposes.

He is, one occasionally feels, somewhat at pains to demonstrate his freedom from partizanship by criticizing certain of Blaine's acts and dissenting pointedly from certain of his opinions. For instance, in



writing of the Fourteenth Amendment, Mr. Stanwood takes space enough to question whether the original plan of Thaddeus Stevens, to base the apportionment of representation in Congress directly on voting population, would not have worked better than the plan Blaine championed and which was finally adopted. He likewise points out the impropriety of Blaine's castigation of B. F. Butler in 1871, when the former was speaker, and so gravely deplores the consequences of the earlier quarrel with Roscoe Conkling that he does not quote the famous passage in which Blaine ridiculed Conkling's "turkey-gobbler strut" and scathingly compared him to Winter Davis. On the other hand, Blaine the writer, the historian, receives well-nigh unqualified praise. I fancy that few close students of the period treated in *Twenty Years of Congress* will agree that it is "calmly judicial" (p. 262). It is true that Blaine surpassed most of his party associates in breadth and liberality, but in his book he is, nevertheless, always a Republican, always a Northerner.

In the main, however, Mr. Stanwood's telling of Blaine's story is sensible, reasonable, and not without a good sense of proportion. He writes simply and straightforwardly, with no striving after brilliancy, and has evidently made considerable use of manuscript and other "original" sources, as well as of information obtained at first hand from Blaine himself and from his family and intimates. Most readers will no doubt turn to the treatment of the grave charges brought against Blaine's integrity in 1876, and again in 1880, during his candidacy for the presidency, as the crucial test of his biographer's trustworthiness. Mr. Stanwood protests, rightly enough, that his space does not permit of a thorough résumé, and entertains no hope of satisfying with his conclusion either side in the controversy. He gives, however, a careful statement, in chronological order, of what he regards as the main facts, and his conclusion is that although Blaine may have been guilty of "indelicacy", as well as of the—shall we say, folly?—of trying to conceal, even from the Maine friends to whom he sold Little Rock and Fort Smith bonds, the fact that he was at the time the paid selling agent of the company, he stands acquitted on "the only charge made against his integrity and independence as a public man" (p. 173). There is certainly not space enough here to give the reasons why one does not find Mr. Stanwood's view of the matter convincing. I will merely remark that he does not seem to have sufficiently well considered the inconsistency between the admitted facts of Blaine's connection with the Fort Smith and Little Rock Company and his own testimony that he bought his bonds at the same price others paid. The half-chapter devoted to the episode, brief as it is, will probably remain the most authoritative statement of the view that Blaine's apologists take of the most severely criticized part of his career.

The final chapter is a commendably moderate and candid estimate of Blaine's "contribution". Mr. Stanwood is doubtless right in holding that Blaine's claim to the rank of statesman rests almost entirely on his



work as Secretary of State under Garfield and Harrison and on his "influence upon the general tendency of the political thought of his countrymen" (p. 363), particularly in the field of world-politics. It is a judgment one may approve without approving Blaine's policies, or the ideals which he inculcated. It is chiefly as a jingo that he demands the historian's attention.

The book does not present the man very vividly. Those readers who never saw him in the flesh, who never even felt that peculiar personal effect which so remarkably extended itself far beyond the circle of his actual acquaintance, will perhaps find him unexplained at the end. But most readers, I think, will be left in a much kindlier mood toward him than they would bring from a reading of Gail Hamilton's extravagant panegyric. One finds it hard not to feel some sympathy and liking for Blaine, however strongly one may condemn the things he did and the things he stood for. He was weak with a very human weakness, rather than callous with the cold-blooded callousness of certain public characters with whom reformers have nowadays to reckon. One is particularly impressed with the Irish quality of his personality; in temperament he was as unmistakably Irish as—Mr. Bernard Shaw. That, perhaps, rather than the mere fact that he had much Irish blood in his veins, was the secret of his popularity with the Irish among his countrymen, and of much of his popularity with his countrymen of other races as well. If we choose to consider his career more puzzling than other men's—and unless we do so consider it, do not we deny him something accorded to every man famous enough to have a biography?—there suggests itself, as a possible clue to his mystery, the combination of an Irish temperament with membership in the Republican party and residence in Maine.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

*Writings on American History, 1903.* A Bibliography of Books and Articles on United States History published during the Year 1903, with some Memoranda on other Portions of America. Prepared by ANDREW CUNNINGHAM McLAUGHLIN, WILLIAM ADAMS SLADE, and ERNEST DORMAN LEWIS. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. November, 1905. Pp. xiv, 172.)

THIS well-executed, handsome, classified bibliography includes 3,591 titles of books and periodical articles and is a most welcome fulfilling of the strongly felt need for such a guide to the newest literature of American history. The number of titles included is itself an exhibition of the need; and a glimpse at the five pages of abbreviations of periodicals referred to, and the three pages of publishers represented, emphasizes the impossibility of the attempt of the student of American history to keep himself abreast of his material without some such aid.

The scope of the work is the same as that of the Richardson and Morse volume for 1902, but the method as regards detail of inclusion, annotation, arrangement, and typography has been radically changed. The inclusion, though liberal, is more chastened, and the annotation, though reasonable in quantity and admirably well judged, does not attempt to give the substance of reviews and is thus reduced to more manageable proportions. The double column and larger type make a more legible and far handsomer page than its predecessor, and the classified arrangement will be welcomed by many, especially by those cultivating a particular field, as an improvement. The classified versus the alphabetical arrangement must be counted a matter of taste so long as there are so many scholars who are confident of the superiority of the classified library catalogue, the classified cyclopedia, and the classified bibliography for their purposes. The main point in this matter is that if the arrangement is alphabetical the work should also have a good classified index, and if classified, a good alphabetical index; and the more than eighty fine-print columns of index to this volume are an admirable compensation for any deficiencies of the classified system.

As a matter of practical observation, however, it must be said that the alphabetical encyclopedia and the alphabetical subject catalogue seem in general to be winning their way in the world with all except the most special students, and even in that most technical field of technology the alphabetical order has been judged most satisfactory in the *Reperitorium der technischen Journal-Literatur* published by the Imperial Patent Office of Germany—one of the very best examples of the current annual bibliography.

In regard to the typographical form, too, it may be said that if (what is devoutly to be wished) there should be a five-year "cumulation" of this bibliography, the fine-print, long-line style, though less handsome, would lend itself better to cumulation.

To attempt to note detailed errors and deficiencies would be futile. Doubtless there are such, as the chief editor remarks in the preface, but the book belongs to a class of work where a certain amount of error is inevitable except under conditions of precaution which would tend to make publication economically impossible. It is enough to say that this volume is an advance and is unusually well done in this matter. In general the book bears the mark of the careful and competent historical student preparing his work for scholars and attaining thus a higher standard of unity and accuracy than the librarian trying to cater to a larger class of needs and wider classes of users.

No one who has not attempted the task has the faintest idea of the amount of pains required to secure proper inclusion and exclusion and decent accuracy in work of this sort, but every one who writes in this field and every librarian who must guide readers in this field owes profound gratitude to Professor McLaughlin and his colleagues for having performed a service so essential to American historical work.

## MINOR NOTICES

Volume XIX. of the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, new series (London, 1905, pp. vi, 388), opens with the Presidential Address by Dr. G. W. Prothero. Professor J. F. Baldwin traces the "Beginnings of the King's Council" in the reigns of John and of Henry III., when this body began to assume a definite and permanent character. In its functions and personnel the council during the minority of Henry III. was based upon the council of John; and after the minority had ended, this body retained its influence. This paper has since been supplemented by Professor Baldwin's articles on "Early Records of the King's Council" in this REVIEW, October, 1905 (XI. 1-15), and on "Antiquities of the King's Council" in the January number of the *English Historical Review*. The history of the English occupation of Tangier (1661-1683) is sketched by Miss Enid Routh, who draws her conclusions from English sources which she briefly describes. A communication by C. T. Flower on the Beverley Town Riots, 1381-1382, based on hitherto unpublished documents, of which some are appended, gives interesting details as to the methods employed by rival oligarchic and bourgeois factions in attempting to acquire and maintain political control of the municipality. Miss E. M. Leonard's able monograph on "The Inclosure of Common Fields in the Seventeenth Century" is an important contribution to English economic history. She seems to have proved her contention that during the seventeenth century the inclosing movement was not suspended, as has been supposed, but on the contrary progressed rapidly. She also presents strong arguments in support of her opinions that inclosure proceedings as conducted in England tended to destroy the small landed proprietor, and create a class of landless laborers; and that the agrarian conditions peculiar to the Midlands caused the strong opposition to inclosures in that part of England, where, contrary to the opinion usually held, inclosures did not proceed with special rapidity, but were, on the contrary, checked by the restrictive measures of the government. In a very readable paper on "Bartolus and the Development of European Political Ideas", the Reverend J. Neville Figgis shows that the fourteenth-century jurist introduced a wider conception of the civil law, which facilitated its reception at a later period. The Alexander Prize Essay for 1904 is a careful narrative of the "Beginnings of the Cistercian Order", by W. A. Parker Mason. Dr. O. Jensen contributes a learned history of the "Denarius Sancti Petri" in England from the time of Canute to Elizabeth, and appends thereto a considerable number of documents from the Vatican. He concludes that Gregory VII. attempted to connect the obligations of the payment of the pence and the oath of allegiance; and gives interesting details regarding the method of collecting the pence and the papal organization finally established in London for this purpose, to the dissatisfaction of the English. Two brief

communications with accompanying documents relate to "Polydore Vergil in the English Law Courts", by I. S. Leadam, and "The Case of Dr. Crowe", clergyman in the reign of Henry VIII., by R. H. Brodie. Mr. H. E. Malden notes instances of bondmen in Surrey under the Tudors. R. G. Marsden has compiled a list of English Ships in the Reign of James I., giving so far as possible their tonnage, ports, voyages, and in some cases references to the documents in which the ships' names occur.

F. G. D.

The supplement to the ninth volume of the *American Journal of Archaeology*, second series, contains the annual reports of the Council and committees of the Archaeological Institute of America.

The report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens includes an obituary notice of the late director of the school, Dr. Theodore Woolsey Heermance. He initiated the project of publishing a thorough study of the Erechtheum, which is now well under way; and the report on the excavations at Corinth is nearing completion. Liberal grants from the Carnegie Institution of Washington will be applied toward the excavations in Corinth, exploration, and a fellowship in architecture.

Grants from the same Institution to the American School of Classical Studies in Rome will be used for publishing the papers of the school, and for research fellowships. The chairman of the Managing Committee adduces evidences of the value of the school in offering educational opportunities to teachers of ancient history and the classics, as well as in training investigators.

The report of the director of the American School for Oriental Study and Research in Palestine contains a highly interesting account of several somewhat perilous excursions, including the circumnavigation of the Dead Sea. The results obtained include the correction of errors in published maps, and other additions to geographical knowledge, many photographic and phonographic records, squeezes of Babylonian, Hebraic, Phoenician, Greek, and Latin inscriptions, studies of local customs and ceremonies, and the discovery of hitherto unknown ruins and city sites.

The Committee on American Archaeology reports a grant to secure information regarding the remains of Indian antiquity in the United States, and grants to the Southwest Society. This vigorous organization has recently collected phonographic records of six hundred Spanish and Indian folk-songs, has conducted archaeological explorations, and has obtained or has been promised large collections of artistic and archaeological interest, many of which formerly belonged to the early Catholic missions and churches of Southern California. The collections will be deposited in a great "Southwest Museum" which the Society is now laboring to erect. Dr. A. M. Tozzer, who will soon complete the term of his four-year fellowship in American archaeology, reports a continuation of his field-work in Mexico and Yucatan. A careful comparison of the narratives of early European visitors with the results of

his own observations shows a remarkable survival of ancient customs and culture. Dr. Tozzer is engaged in compiling a full bibliography of Mexico and Central America.

Mr. J. N. Larned's two well-printed volumes, *Seventy Centuries of the Life of Mankind* (Springfield, Mass., C. A. Nichols Company, 1905, pp. 465, 539), is more extended than a book of dates like Ploetz's *Epitome of Universal History*, but is not full enough to take rank as a history of the world. None the less is it a useful book. Mr. Larned has a keen eye for what is salient, and he lays much emphasis upon personal character, with the result that a sketch of the history of the world in two not portly volumes is positively readable. In its reaction against old-time cock-sureness, based on inadequate knowledge, the present age looks with skepticism, at times not unmingled with amusement, upon philosophies of history. The attitude is not wholly reasonable, for the doctrine of evolution is a philosophy of nature, and human society represents a process of evolution too. But for so vast a field we distrust our inductions. Mr. Larned, however, has no misgivings. "The story of the life of mankind is divided naturally, by great changes of circumstance, into six epochs" (I. v). It is true that when we come to survey these epochs they prove very loose indeed. There is not much that is distinctive in the first—the "Epoch of the Earliest Civilizations and Known Empires"; and the other five are hardly more illuminating: "Epoch of the Greeks and Romans"; "Epoch of the New Nations, known as the Middle Ages"; "Epoch of Modernizing Expansions, called the Renaissance"; "Epoch of Political Revolutions"; "Epoch of Science, Mechanism, Democracy, and the Transforming of the World". Mr. Larned does not attempt the difficult task of tracing the vital connection between the epochs. He contents himself with sketching at the beginning of each the "chief characters"—not, be it observed, the chief characteristics—of the period. These sketches are usually accompanied by portraits of the persons concerned, for the most part taken from good sources, and useful. But from the point of view of serious history, we have not much to say in favor of the numerous fanciful pictures of historic scenes which embellish other pages. Mr. Larned's point of view is not wholly impartial or critical, and when he comes down to recent times he cannot conceal his dislike of the German emperor, his distrust of American imperialism, his scorn of the European intrusion into China. He may be right, but his is not the judicial tone of Ranke or of Stubbs. Nor does his list of authorities show very extensive reading even in the secondary sources, and it is confined to works in English. Yet his book is to be praised; it is an accurate and lucid summary of the chief events in world-history put forth in an attractive form.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

The initial number of the twenty-fourth volume of the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law is an essay by Dr. Lynn Thorndike on *The Place of Magic in the Intellectual His-*

*tory of Europe* (New York, Macmillan, 1905, pp. 110). As the author himself has the discretion to point out, the present essay is far from being an attempt at a complete treatment of that theme. After merely illustrating the persistence throughout the Middle Ages of belief in magic, he devotes this paper to a somewhat more careful survey of its place in the thought of the Roman Empire. He has dipped for himself into the ancient writers, has gathered much curious information, and has set it forth with gusto and with considerable sprightliness of style; but his study, though intelligent, is sadly lacking in thoroughness, and yet more so in closeness of thought and precision of diction. Of magic itself his conception is confused in the extreme. If the further research which his ambitious title seems to promise is to have a serious worth for scholarship, he must gird himself for a much more strenuous grapple with his subject.

*An Introduction to the History of Sugar as a Commodity.* By Ellen Deborah Ellis. [Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Monograph Series, Volume IV.] (Philadelphia, The John C. Winston Company, 1905, pp. 117.) This monograph is based largely, though not entirely, upon secondary sources and cannot be said to add materially to what was already known. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is an attempt to analyze and relate historical phenomena in strict accordance to such economic concepts as production, consumption, supply, demand, etc. The economic terminology as used tends to obscure rather than to illuminate the subject. For example, the statement that "the English succeeded in winning for themselves the monopoly in the production of sugar values in exchange" (p. 85) does not at once suggest the meaning which it appears to have—that the English acquired a monopoly of the sugar-trade.

*Lectures on the History of the Middle Ages.* By George D. Ferguson, Professor of History, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. (Kingston, Uglow and Company, 1905, pp. viii, 634.) Professor Ferguson's work contains a series of thirty-three lectures upon medieval history, delivered before students "substantially in the form in which they are here presented". After a preliminary discourse on the continuity of history, he takes up the causes of the fall of the Roman Empire, discusses principles of law and custom which passed on to later generations, and devotes three chapters to the settlements of the Germanic races in Europe. In the further pursuit of the subject the author has had in mind especially the development of political institutions as affected by feudalism, and has made France the chief source of his illustrative examples.

The literary defects of the lecture form are not very apparent, but it would have been better to eliminate the few traces remaining. The work makes no pretensions to new views of the Middle Ages, nor is there anything novel in the order of treatment. The lectures undoubtedly

served a good purpose in vivifying by the spoken word a complex subject to an audience of students, but in a printed work they do not compare favorably with essays already in the field, like Professor George B. Adams's *Civilization during the Middle Ages*. Both assume the reader to be familiar with the general history of the period, but there is a great difference in the clearness of exposition.

The outward appearance of the work is not agreeable. Owing to the thickness of the paper, the book occupies twice the space it needs, and has a dropsical effect which is not relieved by artistic excellences in printing. The proof-reading deserved more attention from a university professor. The foot-notes bristle with misprints, particularly of foreign words. The author has given evidence of wide reading and much scholarly thought, and yet one may question the advisability of publishing this work.

J. M. VINCENT.

The interest aroused in the controversy concerning Toscanelli and Columbus, originated by the communications of Señor Gonzalez de la Rosa and Mr. Henry Vignaud to the Congress of Americanists held at Paris in 1900, may be measured by the length of the annotated bibliography of the controversy printed by Signor G. Uzielli among the *Atti* of the Fifth Italian Geographical Congress, held in Naples in 1904, and also issued in separate form (*Bibliografia della Polemica concernente Paolo Toscanelli e Cristoforo Colombo*, Naples, A. Tocco-Salviotti, 1905). This bibliography, consisting of references to one hundred and sixty-nine books, papers, and reviews, has been largely compiled by Mr. Vignaud, and much of it was printed by him in 1903 in his answers to Sir Clements Markham and Mr. C. R. Beazley. Signor Uzielli has translated the bibliography, added considerably to it, and prefaced it with an introduction which states the questions at issue and includes two documents discovered by him and previously printed: a note regarding a colloquy held in 1454 between Toscanelli and the Portuguese ambassadors; and a letter written in 1494 by the Duke of Ferrara to his ambassador in Florence, asking him to get from the nephew of Toscanelli notices made by his uncle regarding certain recently discovered islands.

F. G. D.

*The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis, 1582-1589.* Edited for the Royal Historical Society from the MS. in the Possession of J. F. Gurney, Esquire, Keswick Hall, Norfolk, by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D. (Harvard). (London, Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1905, pp. li, 105.) In this handsomely printed little volume Dr. Usher has made a contribution to the obscure history of the Puritan attempts to introduce modifications of ministerial appointments, worship, and discipline into the English Church, in the third decade of the reign of Elizabeth, that will be appreciated by students of the ecclesiastical and political history of the time. The Dedham Classis was but one of a number of similar organizations, but its story was doubtless typical of



that of the movement as a whole. And the record of its eighty meetings, here reproduced, brings out in clear light the tentative methods of these early Puritans, their difficulties in enforcing a discipline that had no coercive power behind it, and their shifts to keep out of the clutches of the law while really doing what the ecclesiastical constitution of England, as then established, did not permit. Dr. Usher had added greatly to the value of these Minutes by his introductory bibliography and notes, by a reprint of the pertinent portions of the *Dangerous Positions*, of which the later archbishop, Richard Bancroft, was the author, and by biographical notices of the ministers involved, or referred to, in the transactions recorded in the Minutes. A brief selection of contemporary letters and papers taken from the same manuscript volume increases the worth of the record. The editing, as a whole, is thoroughly well done. One may query, indeed, whether Dr. Usher has not overemphasized the significance of such disagreements and divergences of view as he finds among these early Puritans. They were feeling their way, and it was only in the larger aspects of a modification of the polity of the Church that approximate unity was to be expected. Nor is there anything surprising in the relatively slight popular support for Puritanism which the record reveals. The Puritan ministers were still comparatively a feeble minority, and their educative work among the population at large had but just begun. Dr. Usher's documents and accompanying notes may well serve, however, to modify the claims which have sometimes been made as to the strength of the Puritan movement during Whitgift's tenure of the archbishopric.

WILLISTON WALKER.

*Chatham.* By Frederic Harrison. (New York, The Macmillan Company, London, Macmillan and Company, 1905, pp. vi, 239.) This monograph is from the point of view of an admirer of Chatham's imperialism. Mr. Harrison regards Chatham as the author of the colonial system and the founder of the empire. "For good and for evil, through heroism and through spoliation, with all its vast and far-reaching consequences, industrial, economic, social, and moral—the foundation of the Empire", he holds, "was the work of Chatham. He changed the course of England's history—nay, the course of modern history. For a century and a half the development of our country has grown upon the imperial lines of Chatham's ideals; and succeeding statesmen have based the keynote of their policy on enlarging the range of these ideals, in warding off the dangers they involved, in curbing or in stimulating the excesses they bred" (p. 2). For statesmen and politicians who have stimulated these excesses, Mr. Harrison has little but contempt. He is an admirer of the imperialism which has made this North American continent Anglo-Saxon in its law and its civilization; but he is strong in his condemnation of the imperialism that means small colonies of white settlers holding in serfdom vast masses of some inferior race. There are no footnotes and no bibliography; but there are internal evidences that little in print—memoirs or letters—concerning Chatham has escaped Mr. Har-



rierson's attention; and this care coupled with his style has given us a monograph on Chatham of abiding value.

EDWARD PORRITT.

The fourth volume of Poultney Bigelow's *History of the German Struggle for Liberty* (New York and London, Harper, 1905, pp. xvi, 304) does not carry the work much beyond the point previously reached, since it deals only with the eve and the first phase of the revolution of 1848. Social conditions which contributed to the outbreak of the revolution consume about one-third of the space, character-sketches of Frederick William IV., Ludwig I. of Bavaria, Prince William of Prussia (the emperor of later days), and of several minor characters occupy a sixth, leaving about one-half of the book for the narrative of the March Revolutions. Save for a single inadequate chapter upon France, there is no serious effort to connect the revolution in Germany with the great European movement of which it was a part, while for Germany itself attention is focussed almost exclusively upon Munich and Berlin.

Both in conception and in execution this volume is stamped with the same qualities which marked its predecessors. It differs from them chiefly in that the common defects are more conspicuous and the merits less pronounced. A slender thread of history is used to string together a multitude of comments upon all sorts of subjects. Many of these are altogether foreign to the matter which furnished the occasion for them, and seem to be inserted for no other purpose than to show the author's extensive travels, display his supercilious wit, or gratify his numerous personal grudges.

The book is divided into thirty short chapters. Apparently the author intended that each chapter should present a portrait, a social study, or the story of some significant event. Taking *en bloc* the chapters devoted to each of the three themes, it cannot be said that he has altogether succeeded with any of them, although portions of each have considerable value for a discriminating reader. The portraits are caricatures; the social studies are mere jumbles of data leading to no definite results; the narratives, owing to digressions, the omission of some essential matters, and overemphasis of others, fail to give a clear and definite idea of what actually occurred, although an exception must be noted for the story of the March Revolution at Berlin.

In the details of book-construction the volume is unusually faulty. A large proportion of the text, probably a third, consists of quotations worked in with so little skill that the volume suggests the note-book rather than the finished production. As is proper in a popular work, most of the quotations are given in translation. Unfortunately their utility for the majority of readers is destroyed by the author's trick of leaving every few lines a sentence or two untranslated. The style is increasingly familiar and journalistic, while badly constructed sentences are numerous. The bibliography is worthless, as it consists of nothing but titles, without even an alphabetical arrangement. The worst feature of the book, however, is its unfortunate tone. In attempting to add

piquancy to his pages the author has gone far afield to drag in *risqué* matter until he has produced a vulgar tone which in places goes perilously close to indecency. The offense against good taste is not mitigated by leaving the worst passages in French, German, or Latin.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*Le Carte d'America di Giacomo Gastaldi: Contributo alla Storia della Cartografia del Secolo XVI.* Per Stefano Grande. (Turin, Hans Rinck, 1905, pp. 167 and 6 facsimiles.) Mr. Henry Harrisse performed a better service than he expected, when he remarked that Italy had no consequential part in the discovery of America. It may be that he realized that Italian students were already coming to the forefront as investigators in the field of historical geography, and that they were soon to challenge his leadership in this direction. He succeeded, at all events, in furnishing them with an incentive to search out the facts concerning many matters whereon had long been based his reputation as a master of historical lore. It would not be fair to Professor Grande to suggest that his study of Gastaldi's American maps, any more than his previous book on the geographer's life and works (1902), was the result of a desire to disprove Mr. Harrisse's statement. The critical reader may be pardoned a feeling, however, that the work owes to Mr. Harrisse some of its excellence.

Professor Grande has made a detailed study of the maps of America drawn by Gastaldi between 1546 and 1562. He shows that they are derivatives from the well-known Ribero maps, although Gastaldi's intimate acquaintance with Ramusio, for whom he prepared the maps in the *Viaggi*, gave him access to many other sources of later information. Previous to the work for Ramusio, Gastaldi had drawn the modern maps for the edition of Ptolemy's *Geography* published at Venice in 1548, the delicate engraving of which contrasts most curiously with the coarse but effective woodcuts in Ramusio's *Viaggi*. In regard to these, Professor Grande makes one slip, due doubtless to some confusion in his notes on the editions of Ptolemy of 1548 and 1561, in both of which Gastaldi's maps were used. It is in the later, and not the earlier, edition that Yucatan is represented as a peninsula instead of an island, a correction much more creditable to the geographer. Professor Grande also seems to be unaware of the existence—important chiefly as a matter of bibliographical interest—of an earlier state of the plate of the large planisphere of 1546, lacking some of the features of the map as reproduced by him in facsimile.

G. P. WINSHIP.

*A History of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1635-1904.* By Elihu S. Riley. (Baltimore, Nunn and Company, 1905, pp. vi, 423.) This work is one of those which have come into existence because of the generosity of a state legislature, which appropriated part or all of the sum needed for purposes of publication. Maryland thus began the

encouragement of her historical students eighty years ago, by an appropriation to Bozman's scholarly and accurate study of the early years of the province. The author of the *History of the General Assembly* is a well-known Annapolis journalist and antiquary and is also the author of a history of the state's capital (1887). His plan in this book has been to treat the sessions of the Assembly in chronological order, giving a brief abstract of the proceedings and of some of the important acts passed. He carries the narrative down to the removal of certain election officials by the governor in July, 1904; and the fact that he devotes over a page to this event shows that he does not always confine himself to occurrences which happened during the sessions of the legislature. The proceedings of the Assemblies which met during the first eighty years of Maryland's history are printed in full in the *Maryland Archives*, and a convenient compendium of many of the important matters contained in the volumes of the *Archives* will be found here. For the eighteenth century the book has more value for the student, as the proceedings of the sessions during this period are not easy to obtain. Out of the 423 pages of the book, 304 treat of the events prior to 1776. This apportionment of attention to the provincial and state periods is a common but unfortunate one, as it does not give room for proper discussion of the important developments of the nineteenth century. In this work the treatment of the Assemblies of the state period is also imperfect, in that the author has almost entirely used the *Statutes* as sources, to the neglect of the *Journals of Proceedings*. The treatment of the period between 1776 and 1860 is especially inadequate. The sessions from 1777 to 1785 are given only five pages. Those from 1812 to 1815 receive only one page. Mr. Riley was state printer in 1861, and his knowledge of men and events of the last half-century has enabled him to intersperse the later pages with a number of interesting anecdotes, character studies, etc., of the men whom he has known. It is a pity that he did not give a longer time to the composition of the work, making it more philosophical and accurate and supplying it with an index, for want of which it loses half its usefulness. There is not even a table of contents.

*The Maryland and Virginia Boundary Controversy (1668-1894)*. By Louis N. Whealton. (New York, Albert J. Leon, [1905], pp. 55, vi.) In these days of frequent boundary disputes and settlements it is interesting to find such a scholarly and eminently satisfactory presentation as that given us by Mr. Whealton in this dissertation presented at Johns Hopkins University. For, although not an international affair, the question of this boundary will always be of interest to the American historian, embracing as it does so much of the history of the settlement and subsequent growth of the two colonies. The student, perhaps more than any one else, will appreciate the amount of research and labor involved in this dissertation, which presents in logical, condensed form facts and laws only to be gleaned from remote and often practically buried sources.

There are described: I. Charters and Grants, 1606-1632; II. The Work of the First Boundary Commissioners, 1632-1668; III. First Fountain of the Potomac, 1698-1776; IV. Compact of 1785; V. Ineffectual Legislation, 1785-1860; VI. Settle[ment] by Arbitration, 1860-1884; VII. Fishery Rights in Common Waters and the Oyster Troubles to 1894. These show, step by step, the cause of each dispute, its discussions, and final settlement.

The first section shows how James's grant to the London Company, following that of Elizabeth to Raleigh, marks the beginning of this boundary question, for "Under this grant, Jamestown was settled in 1607. Here we find Virginia's first boundaries, which, on the north and south after 1607 were each fifty statute miles distant from Jamestown" (p. 6). This and the subsequent grants led to the work of the first boundary commissioners, as "The grant to Lord Baltimore, in 1632, was regarded as an infringement upon the Virginia Charter of 1609, and during the first half of the seventeenth century, the Colony settled by the London Company strenuously asserted its claim to the Maryland territory. This was the beginning of a long dispute" (pp. 12-13). It is shown how the first commission was followed by one dispute after another with partial adjustments, until the final settlement by arbitration, 1860-1884, and the agreement upon the "Fishery Rights" in 1894.

*Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by Worthington Chauncey Ford, Chief, Division of Manuscripts. Vol. IV. 1776, January 1 to June 4 (Washington, 1906, pp. 416). In arrangement and mode of editing this fourth volume, naturally, follows the same system which Mr. Ford has established in the first three. The workmanship is of similarly high character, the text of the actual journal being supplemented by the texts of the reports and other documents, derived from the papers of the Continental Congress in Mr. Ford's official custody. John Adams's autobiography, Force's *Archives*, and other authorities are drawn upon for notes. While the main transactions of 1776, those relative to the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the negotiations with France fall into the next volume, many matters of civil and military interest find here a much more ample and perfect record than they have ever had hitherto.

*State Government in Maryland, 1777-1781*, by Beverly W. Bond, jr. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXIII, Nos. 3-4] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1905, pp. 118), is a thorough and painstaking research based upon original sources. The task of organizing the state government with the separation of the legislative, the executive, and the judicial functions is fully described; the chief innovations being the substitution in place of the governor and upper house of the Assembly, formerly proprietary or

crown appointees, a Senate chosen by the people through the indirect method of county electors, and a governor and council annually chosen by the Assembly.

Considerable attention is given to the attitude of the state government toward the Continental Congress and the question of state sovereignty; and this is emphasized in the controversy over the cession to the United States of the "back lands" claimed by Virginia. New light is thrown by the author upon this controversy, not hitherto revealed in Adams's *Maryland's Influence upon Land Cessions to the United States*, and it is shown (p. 24) that Maryland as early as October 30, 1776, had put herself upon record in demanding that the so-called "back lands" "be considered common stock to be parcelled out at any time into convenient, free, and independent governments"; and by unfalteringly adhering to her position, and refusing to ratify the Articles of Confederation, Maryland forced the Virginian cessions, saved the union, and prepared the way for the organization of the Northwest Territory.

The author has described also the aid rendered to the Continental army, the currency situation in the state, commercial relations, the confiscation of British property, internal disturbances, and the treatment of the Tories. He has pointed out repeatedly the disposition of the state to brook no coercion or interference in internal administration by Congress, and to reserve to herself the rights of a sovereign state, until the ratification of the Articles of Confederation, in foreign as well as in her domestic concerns; as seen, for example, in her ratification of the treaty with France.

Ample references to the *Maryland Archives*, contemporary letters, and other sources are given in the foot-notes and the appended bibliography. At times there is a lack of clearness; and much of the matter in the foot-notes might better have been incorporated in the text. A more varied and interesting style, with fewer short sentences and with a more adequate interpretation of events, would have improved the work.

J. W. B.

*Democracy in the South before the Civil War.* By G. W. Dyer, M.A., Instructor in Economics and Sociology in Vanderbilt University. (Nashville, Tenn., Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905, pp. 90.) This is a controversial essay in the interpretation of social history. While its substance is of very uneven value, the style and thought are vigorous, and the book deserves attention as a product of its time—as one of numerous protests from the thoughtful youth of the South against the injustice done their people by the general American historians. The introduction is good and strong, and, except for a somewhat excessive belligerency, the general attitude of the author is well taken. He breaks down at times, however, when making concrete applications of his sweeping charge of error in the work of the general historians; and as is true of many other controversialists, his fault here lies in his failure to apply his own precepts. He complains

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—47.

of the amateurishness of the historians in societary interpretation due to a lack of proper technical training, and to a disposition to generalize too widely from given data. Mr. Dyer himself is not perfect in either historical or statistical method; his statements are sometimes rash and his reasoning faulty. For example, he contends (pp. 41-43) that there was no tendency in the South to the monopolizing of land and slaves, because from the nature of agriculture a relatively small farm must have a differential advantage over a large one. Here he has failed to realize that the production of the southern staples was an exceptional sort of agriculture, in which unintelligent labor could be used with profit on a large scale under expert supervision, and that the plantation system furnished a method of organization and control which gave the relatively large producer a decisive advantage. He attempts (p. 60) to prove that the market value of the slaves should be incorporated in any comparison of per capita wealth North and South. His reasoning here, if not in a circle, is certainly in a tangle. In several instances the author commits the fallacy of proving too much. These are, of course, the faults of his controversial method. The author shows himself, in spite of his temporary faults, to be a student of distinct power and promise. Many of his ideas are genuine contributions, in accord with the best philosophy of the Old South. He has evidently secured a number of valuable facts and statistics from local records and other unique sources, and the further publication which he has promised in his preface will be awaited with interest. Meanwhile he is entitled to our thanks for very justly emphasizing the existence and importance in the South of a powerful though hampered democracy in industry, society, and politics.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

*Antonio López de Santa Anna: Mi Historia Militar y Política; 1810-1874; Memorias Inéditas.* (Mexico, Librería de la Vda. de Ch. Bouret, 1905, pp. viii, 281.) The second volume of the collection called "Documentos inéditos ó muy raros para la Historia de Mexico", edited by Genaro García and Carlos Pereyra, contains the hitherto unprinted autobiography of Santa Anna. This autobiography is disappointing both as a human document and as a source for history. While in exile at Nassau, New Providence, between 1870 and 1874, Santa Anna wrote the story of his life with the purpose of "rebutting the infamous calumnies of his enemies with an exact statement of fact". The autobiography, therefore, is in no sense a confession. It is a vainglorious appeal to his countrymen for justice in the tone and temper of a revolutionary *pronunciamiento*, in the writing of which he had had long experience. All of the narrative was written from memory, as the author admits that his private papers had been destroyed many years before. What mistakes he might have made during his long career were, he asserted, due to excess of zeal for his country's welfare, and he felt that he had fairly earned the title of

patriot. This being the case, he believed that posterity would do him justice. By such an elimination of modesty, Santa Anna's narrative passes out of the reach of historical criticism.

His test of the patriotism and ability of his contemporaries is the assistance or opposition given him personally by each. For the disaster of the Texas campaign he blames the disobedience of General Filisola. Only by a traitorous disclosure of his plans was Taylor saved from annihilation by Santa Anna just before Buena Vista. The cowardice of General Alvarez, the "Panther of the South", was responsible for the Mexican defeat at Molino del Rey. The result of the fight at the Belén gate is ascribed to the same quality in General Terres. These instances of Santa Anna's point of view are taken almost at random. Circumstantial description of the military events of the war between Mexico and the United States is wholly lacking. No comment, save by denial, is made concerning his relations with Polk. Not a word is said about the understanding had in July, 1846, at Havana, with Polk's emissary, Alexander Slidell Mackenzie. For Santa Anna's justification of his campaign during the war, one must turn to his *Apelacion* or vindication, published in 1849. Enough has been said to show that Santa Anna's autobiography is the product of a vainly ambitious and conscienceless adventurer, who after all his efforts confesses that "the man is nothing, power everything". The typography of the book is poor; the proof-reading execrable.

JESSE S. REEVES.

*John Fiske.* By Thomas Sergeant Perry. [The Beacon Biographies.] (Boston, Small, Maynard, and Company, 1906, pp. xii, 105.) This brief biography cannot be commended for accuracy, abundance of information, discriminating judgment, or literary merit. On p. vii we learn that John Fiske was born at Middletown; on p. 4, that Hartford was his birthplace. The author discusses the learning of the historian, the lucidity of his style, the relation of his evolutionary philosophy to his historical method, and his interest in re-grouping known facts rather than in discovering new. The temper of the book is sufficiently illustrated by a single quotation: "Those who disapproved of Fiske instinctively, tried to persuade themselves, and others, that it was because he did not work in the archives. . . . One is always glad of an excuse for hating one's kind; and this excuse could serve as well as another . . . Still there is something to be said in favour of the method which lets the store of information filter through an intelligent mind on its way to the reader" (pp. 66-67). The book is prefaced by a chronology of Fiske's life and writings, and concludes with a brief bibliography.

F. G. D.



## TEXT-BOOKS

*A History of Mediæval and Modern Europe.* By HENRY E. BOURNE, Professor in the College for Women, Western Reserve University. (New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Pp. xxii, 502.)

*Essentials in Mediæval and Modern History (from Charlemagne to the Present Day).* By SAMUEL BANNISTER HARDING, Ph.D., Professor of European History, Indiana University, in consultation with ALBERT BUSWELL HART, LL.D., Professor of History, Harvard University. [Essentials in History.] (New York: American Book Company. 1905. Pp. 612, xxxi.)

It is safe to say that those of us who have not written a text-book in any field of history can have no adequate idea of the difficulty of writing a suitable manual for the high-school course on the mediæval and modern periods. At the same time, any experienced teacher of history should find it easy to see that the authors of the two manuals named above have done their work with no mean appreciation of the magnitude of the task. And yet, with all the pains those books have evidently cost, one must still wonder whether either of them offers a quite satisfactory solution of the problem in view.

Professor Bourne's volume—which is understood to be the first in a new series of such texts—begins with "The Roman Empire in the Fourth Century" and goes from there on, in a series of chapters which have in total but four hundred and seventy-six pages. Brevity is thus one of its special features; and a feature which should be reckoned with by those who may contemplate using the book. It has been gained largely by "the omission of many facts which are ordinarily explained or at least mentioned"; yet the number of subjects treated is so large that the omitting of "facts", whatever else it has accomplished, has emphasized generality of statement. And the question comes up whether, for the average youth of the second year of the high-school, a specially brief text-book is after all in the best way to have advantage over longer ones if its brevity be not gained by a more rigorous restriction not so much of "facts" as of subjects than is practised here. In any case, there can hardly be doubt on this point: the use of so short a manual involves relying in a special degree upon sources of information outside of the text-book; it demands a good supply of books for supplementary reading. It is rightly observed that such books "are constantly increasing in numbers and utility"; but the point at present is, no teacher should think it feasible to use this manual unless his classes can actually have access to a good many of such books. And he it said forthwith that Professor Bourne for his part shows the way into these books, if they are but at hand: he gives references at the end of each chapter, classifying them, some for "general reading", others for reading on the various sections of the chapter, a third lot for "additional reading", and occasionally still others "for review".



A further feature of this text is the one which arises from "the attempt . . . to narrate the history of the more important countries together in chronological order, instead of giving to each a separate treatment". So, for example, the titles of chapters relating to the Middle Ages after Charlemagne run, "Beginnings of Feudal Europe", "The New Europe, its Rulers and its Foes", "The Rise of the People", "The Ruin of the Empire: The Growth of England and France", "Wars of Nations and Races: The Cry of Reform in the Church". The justification offered for proceeding thus is that while the other plan obliges "the reader to move forward and backward along the chronological series" and involves "an unusual effort of attention" to "make the necessary correlation of events" and "gain an adequate conception of the progress of Europe as a whole", this method of exposition "should possess the advantages of a larger unity, making intelligible what might otherwise seem the consequence of individual caprice or of chance", and "should also accustom the pupil to group events, in order by discovering their relations to gain more of their meaning". But whatever reasons may be advanced in favor of this method in general, the cardinal query arises here, Does it justify itself in this particular case? Is it practised in this instance in such a way that it contributes to the framing of a course which is adapted to children of the second year of the high-school? Is it true that our teachers of history in this grade can best stir the interest and understanding of their pupils concerning Europe in 936-1154 by using a chapter which will lead them successively to the eastern and northern borders of the old Frankish empire, to England under the Danes and William the Conqueror, to Germany and Italy from Otto's revival of the emperors through the pontificate of Gregory VII., to the East in the time of the first crusade, then back to Germany for the compromise upon investiture, then to France and England for the first Capetians and the rise of Henry II.? This chapter, to be sure, is hardly a fair example of the twenty-nine others, but what it illustrates in a special degree is sufficiently characteristic of the book as a whole to give importance to the practical question already suggested: Is the principle of exposition here followed, however reasonable it may be in theory, actually applied by Professor Bourne in a way to make his outline clear and definite enough for the uses designed for it? The reviewer wishes only to raise the point; it would be idle for him to do more. The decision upon it should rest with those who have charge of classes in history in the grade in view.

As for the illustrations, they occupy a modest, though it would seem sufficient proportion of the space, and they are appropriately chosen. Further they have the distinction of being accompanied each by an explanation or description, after the manner of some similar manuals in Europe.

Turning to Professor Harding's volume: though it differs in various particulars from its competitors, it is constructed on the same general principles as the other numbers of the now well-known series in which

it is the last to appear. Accordingly, the form and more mechanical features of the book call for no description here; teachers will be asking rather whether it promises well as a practical working-guide, whether it treats medieval and modern history with an eye appropriately single to pupils of the second year of the high-school.

It deals with the period before Charlemagne in only an introductory chapter—thus conforming fully with the plan of the Committee of Seven—and then gives upwards of five hundred and fifty pages to the time since about 800. And the matter of these pages, spite of the pedagogical suggestions of their title, is set forth rather more after the manner of history than of the school-room. To an extent by no means usual in such books, things are here told in a way to let one see that they came about quite naturally, quite as human beings might do them. Also, the text is frequently assisted by interesting and well-produced illustrations; and by maps, a considerable number of which are exceptionally effective.

At the same time—and here possibly is the first entrance for doubt—the number of subjects handled in this book is very large; some of the chapters seem indeed quite encyclopedic. One may wonder whether it is wise, in a manual for pupils of the second year of the high-school, to introduce for treatment in a score of pages on “The Age of Frederick the Great (1748–1786)”: three or four subjects concerning France in the first half of the reign of Louis XV.; the rearrangement of alliances and the opening of the Seven Years’ War in 1756, the course of the war in Europe, its antecedents and outcome in America, its antecedents and Great Britain’s victory in India, the close and the results of the war; growth of England’s sea-power; “The Eastern Question (1683–1792)”; partitions of Poland; England under George III.; Europe and the American war; the “enlightened despots”, with special reference to Frederick the Great and Joseph II.; eclipse of the Jesuit order; and eighteenth-century literature. This much at least is true: if consideration of what is “essential” has not permitted the author to leave some of these many subjects out of the text-book, then the responsibility of making omissions is simply passed on to the teacher; and if the teacher does not happen to be equal to this responsibility, the pupil must gulp down a great deal of intellectual food which he will not be able to digest.

Again, one may wonder whether the things said upon the subjects here introduced are not, either by their content or their manner, too often much above the heads of the pupils in view. Can it be, for example, that the account Professor Harding gives of the feudal system is within the reach of the average boy or girl of fifteen to sixteen years? The reviewer, for his part, knows hundreds of college students who should find many places in this book none too easy for them; its paragraphs, and sentences, and words, are often exceeding substantial. And this is not to imply that our high-school pupils should be fed their history with a golden spoon. It is rather to suggest that this guide, if it were less weighty, would possibly have more assurance of stimulating interest and work on the part of those who may use it.

In the matter of scholarship neither of these manuals deserves any indictment. Any one possessing special knowledge of European history could easily find statements which he would not make in just the way they appear here. But teachers may feel assured that if their pupils get possession of as straight knowledge of a great part of our past as is to be found in either of these volumes, they will have, to say the least, a perfectly safe foundation for further study. The spirit of them, too, is above reproach; the impression they leave is wholesome. The open question about them rather is, Are they too difficult? With all their virtues, are they yet out of the range of the immature folk they are meant to help?

EARLE WILBUR DOW.

## COMMUNICATION

### *The Philippine "Situado" from the Treasury of New Spain*

REFERRING to the previous communications to the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW on the above subject, viz., one by Professor Edward Gaylord Bourne (X. 459-461) and one by me (X. 929-932), I wish now to call attention to the subsequent publication in *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, XXVII., of the 1637 *Memorial* of Juan Grau y Monfalcón, and to acquiesce in Professor Bourne's judgment that the data as to the Philippine budget in this document entirely prove the case for the contention that the subsidy from the treasury of Mexico to that of the Philippines was in net cash, and amounted to about a quarter of a million pesos annually. At the time of my previous communication, I had never had a chance to see the Grau y Monfalcón memorial, which Professor Bourne had consulted in *Collección de Documentos Inéditos del Archivo de Indias, América y Oceanía* (Madrid, 1866). Grau y Monfalcón's statements are not only clear enough, but the figures he adduces are conclusive on the particular points which were under discussion in the communications referred to above. The citations from the new and first English version of this memorial which are especially pertinent are to be found on pages 121 and 136 to 141 of volume XXVII. of *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*. This and the preceding two volumes also contain other data corroborative as to the amount of the subsidy, the manner of its calculation and payment, etc.

It is still true, however, that we lack evidence of the payment of this subsidy every year, especially throughout the eighteenth century. The citations from various authorities down to the early part of the nineteenth century, made by Professor Bourne in his communication in question, create very much more than the presumption that the subsidy became a recognized feature and that it acquired a fixed value of 250,000 pesos annually. Doubtless, consultation of the budgets of Mexico and the Philippine Islands, so far as they are available, would be necessary to prove the practice to have been constant up to the earliest years of the nineteenth century. There may have been, and probably were, lapses in the practice, as there were interruptions to the rule of annual communication by the trading galleons between Mexico and the Philippines.

I only ventured in my previous communication to question the definiteness of our knowledge as to the subsidy's being paid in the manner and amount ordinarily accepted by Philippine historians as being established fact. Grau y Monfalcón settles that question, at least for the first half of the seventeenth century. The considerations which I raised as regarding Spanish settlements and attempts at conquest in the Mo-

lucas and the Orient, using the Philippines as the base and the source of equipment and maintenance, are given yet more point by the Grau y Monfalcón memorial. He makes out the annual cost for merely the maintenance of such settlements to be more than the subsidy from Mexico, let alone the cost in money, labor, and timber, of various expensive expeditions then quite recent. Of course, any fair balancing of accounts as between Spain and the Philippines must take these things into account.

JAMES A. LEROY.

DURANGO, MEXICO, January 23, 1906.

## NOTES AND NEWS

### GENERAL

The work of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution progresses along the lines described in the last issue of this journal. An addition to the series of "aids and guides" has been projected, to assist in meeting the desires of those students of church history who wish that greater activity might be shown in the United States in the publishing of documentary materials for its religious history. As a necessary preliminary, and with the hope of encouraging such a movement, the Department has undertaken the preparation of a systematic inventory of the unprinted materials for American ecclesiastical and religious history to be found in the archives and libraries of denominations, missionary societies, theological seminaries, and colleges. The Protestant repositories will first be taken up. The work in them has been confided to Professor William H. Allison of Franklin College, formerly fellow in church history in the University of Chicago and instructor in that subject in the Pacific Theological Seminary at Oakland. The director of the Department sailed for Europe in the latter part of March, chiefly to inspect establishments of similar nature and objects. He will return early in July. Mr. Waldo G. Leland has at the same time undertaken a briefer tour of investigation in the Southern states. Miss Davenport goes to London in July, chiefly to gather for Professor Andrews additional material toward the completion of his Guide to the Materials for American History in the London Archives.

General Bartolomé Mitre, former president of the Argentine Republic, and author of several important historical works, died on January 19 at the age of eighty-three. Among his writings were *Historia de Belgrano y de la Independencia Argentina*, first published in 1857, and a history of the emancipation of South America of which a condensed translation was published in 1893.

Émile Boutmy, the founder and for more than thirty years the director of the École Libre des Sciences Politiques, died on January 25, at the age of seventy-one. His writings were mostly studies in comparative constitutional law and in national psychology. One of his best-known books is his *Développement de la Constitution et de la Société Politique en Angleterre*, and his most important recent works are his *Essai d'une Psychologie Politique du Peuple Anglais, au XIXe Siècle* (1901) and *Éléments d'une Psychologie Politique du Peuple Américain* (1902), in which he treats of national institutions as the expression of national personality. While he sometimes depended too largely upon deduction, his writings are always interesting and suggestive. He was

an intimate friend of Taine, of whom he wrote in a volume entitled *Taine, Scherer, Laboulaye* (1901).

Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff, who died on January 12 in his seventy-seventh year, was a man of broad interests and manifold activities. Between the years 1868 and 1886 he served as Under-secretary of State for India, Under-secretary for the Colonies, and Governor of Madras. From 1889 to 1893 he was President of the Royal Geographical Society, and he was President of the Royal Historical Society from 1892 to 1899. His writings include lives of Sir Henry Maine and Ernest Renan, political studies, *Notes of an Indian Journey* (1876), and his voluminous *Notes from a Diary* (1897-1904), which covers the fifty years from 1851 to 1901, but does not treat much of politics.

The literary remains of the late Professor York Powell, together with selected letters and a memoir, are to be published by the Clarendon Press under the editorship of Professor Oliver Elton, who has made an appeal for the loan of letters and for biographical material.

An account of the life and character of Ranke, with special reference to his visit to England, has been written by his son General F. von Ranke for the *Temple Bar* for March.

On December 15 the history tutors of Balliol College gave a dinner in honor of Mr. R. L. Poole and of the completion of the twentieth year of his connection with the *English Historical Review*, which he helped to found and of which he is now the editor. Nearly one hundred and fifty of the contributors to the *Review* were present. Addresses were made by Mr. James Bryce, Professors C. H. Firth, H. F. Pelham, and others. A general index and index of the articles, notes, documents, and selected reviews of books contained in the first twenty volumes of the *Review* has been published by Longmans (pp. 59).

Professor Hermann Oncken, who has been teaching modern German history at the University of Chicago during the first two quarters of the present academic year, has been appointed professor of modern history in the university of Giessen.

Mr. H. E. Egerton, M.A., the author of *A Short History of British Colonial Policy*, has been appointed to the Beit Professorship of Colonial History at Oxford.

Mr. J. G. de R. Hamilton has been elected assistant professor of history in the University of North Carolina.

Professor C. Oman's *Inaugural Lecture on the Study of History* has been published by Frowde (pp. 32).

The house of Weidmann of Berlin has recently issued the second volume of the collected writings of Theodore Mommsen, which contains his essays on the Roman jurists and the Roman law-books. The same house has published a bibliography of Professor Mommsen's writings, compiled by K. Zangemeister and E. Jacobs and entitled *Theodor*

Mommsen als Schriftsteller (pp. xi, 189), and the historian's *Reden und Aufsätze* (pp. viii, 479).

A *List of Doctoral Dissertations in Progress* in American universities has recently been printed and distributed. One hundred and seventeen dissertations, in preparation at thirteen universities, are included. Of these seventy-two are in the field of American history, of which one relates to the West Indies and one to Canada. The remaining seventy, relating to the United States, may be classified roughly as follows: political history, forty-three; economic history, twelve; social history, seven; religious history, five; culture (educational) history, two; biography, one. Only twelve relate, either in whole or mainly, to the period prior to 1787, while sixty are in the period since that year. Of those dealing with political history, six are local in character, six deal with the history of political parties, five with territorial administration, four with reconstruction, three with nullification, states' rights, and secession, and two with the Civil War, the remainder being scattered. Of the theses outside the American field, all but two relate to the medieval or modern history of western Europe. The exceptions are one in Assyrian history and one on the diplomatic relations between Russia and Japan. Thirteen treat of the Middle Ages, and seven of these of the church. The theses relating to modern times fall into the following groups: the Renaissance, two; the period of the Reformation, eight; the period of Religious Wars, four; French Revolution, six; modern economic history, five; modern institutional and constitutional history, two each; diplomatic history and the history of thought, one each. Nineteen theses relate to England, eight to France, four to the Netherlands, three to Germany, three to Spain, and to Austria, Italy, Sweden, and western Asia, one each.

Professor E. Bernheim has contributed a volume to the *Sammlung Götschen* entitled *Einleitung in die Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, Götschen, 1905, pp. 156) which is mostly an abridgment of his *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* but also contains some new matter addressed to the less advanced student.

Drs. S. Widmann, P. Fischer, and W. Felten are editing an *Illustrierte Weltgeschichte* in four volumes, published by the Allgemeine Verlagsgesellschaft, Munich, which is publishing the *Illustrierte Kirchengeschichte*.

Dr. Edward Westermarck, author of *Human Marriage*, has completed the first volume of his book on "The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas", which is about to be published by Messrs. Macmillan.

Dr. G. Schuster has published through Leibing, Leipzig, a work of two volumes entitled *Die geheimen Gesellschaften, Verbindungen und Orden*.

The Grand Prix Gobert has been awarded by the French Academy to M. E. Daudet for his *Histoire de l'Émigration*.



The subject of Lord Curzon's Romanes lecture will be "Frontiers", which he will discuss from historical, political, legal, and other aspects.

The first volume of *Documents Inédits pour servir à l'Histoire du Christianisme en Orient* (Paris, Picard, pp. 200) has been edited by Father A. Rabbath, and contains a portion of the mass of documents that he has collected from the archives of Paris, the Vatican, and other depositories.

Professor E. H. Parker of the Victoria University, Manchester, has published a book on *China and Religion* (London, Murray, 1905, pp. xxv, 317), which treats of "the whole history of the religious question as it has affected the Chinese mind", beginning with China's primitive religion, and discussing each of the various religions which have had root in the country.

The fourth annual meeting of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland was held in Trenton, New Jersey, on March 9-10. Three principal topics were considered and discussed: "The problem of correlating the work in history in the elementary school, high-school, and college", "Differentiation in treatment of the American Revolution in elementary school, high-school, and college", and "The training of teachers for the teaching of history."

The *Proceedings* of the North Central History Teachers Association at its seventh annual meeting, a year ago, have recently been published. The papers and discussions relate mainly to two subjects: "What can the college expect from the high-school course in history?" and "Should civics and United States history be taught together or separately in the high-school?"

An *Atlas of European History*, containing some forty-eight maps, has been published by Professor Earle W. Dow through Holt and Company.

Doubtless most teachers of European history have already become acquainted with the second volume of Professor Robinson's valuable *Readings in European History* (Ginn and Co., pp. 624), which was published early in the year. An abridged edition of the *Readings* (pp. 573) has been issued in a single volume, many of the extracts and portions of the bibliographies contained in the two-volume edition being omitted.

The *Teachers' Bulletin* (University of Cincinnati) for November is devoted to a short but suggestive article by Professor Merrick Whitcomb on "Aids in the Teaching of History."

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. H. Sabine, *Hume's Contribution to the Historical Method* (Philosophical Review, January); Ronald McNeill, *Froude and Freeman* (Monthly Review, February); A. Lang, *Freeman versus Froude* (Cornhill Magazine, February); E. Lavis, *Alfred Rambaud* (Revue de Paris, January 15); H. Oncken, *Albert Schäffles Lebenserinnerungen* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCVI. 2); H.

Grauert, P. *Heinrich Denifle O. Pr. Ein Wort zum Gedächtnis und zum Frieden* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXVI. 4); L. Lévy-Brühl, *Émile Boulmy* (La Revue de Paris, February 15); A. D. Xénopol, *La Notion de "Valeur" en Histoire* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October); E. Michel, *Le Sentiment de la Nature et l'Histoire de la Peinture de Paysage* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October); P. Hermant, *Les Mystiques, Étude Psychologique et Sociale*, concl. (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October); L. Barrau-Dihigo, *L'Enseignement Supérieur de l'Histoire*, I, II. (Revue de Synthèse Historique, October, December); H. Beschorner, *Wesen und Aufgaben der historischen Geographie* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, February); P. Caron, *Des Conditions Actuelles du Travail d'Histoire Moderne en France* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, December); Ch. V. Langlois, *La Question de l'École des Chartes* (Revue Bleue, January 27); G. Monod, *La Chaire d'Histoire au Collège de France* (Revue Bleue, December 9, 16, and 23); Émile Durkheim, *L'évolution et le Rôle de l'Enseignement Secondaire en France* (Revue Bleue, January 20); H. Oncken, *The Study of History in the University of Berlin* (The [Chicago] University Record, January).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

Three series of source-books, planned by the late President W. R. Harper, are to be published by the University of Chicago Press: *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, edited by Professor R. F. Harper; *Ancient Records of Egypt*, edited by Professor J. H. Breasted, whose *History of Egypt* was noted in the last number of the REVIEW; and *Ancient Records of Palestine, Phoenicia, and Syria*, edited by President W. R. Harper. The second of these series is now being issued in four volumes, and forms a complete collection of the literary sources of Egyptian history to the Persian Conquest, 525 B. C., translated into English and elucidated by introductions and notes.

The lectures delivered last November at the Collège de France by M. Édouard Naville on the subject of the religion of ancient Egypt will be published in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, and later by the Musée Guimet.

Dr. Frederick J. Bliss, who has had a prominent part in Syrian explorations, is the author of a volume on *The Development of Palestine Exploration* (Scribners, 1906), which presents in amplified form lectures delivered before the Union Theological Seminary in 1903. The book treats of the progress made in the art of identifying sites, of the shifting point of view of travellers of different times, of Edward Robinson, Renan and his contemporaries, and of the Palestine Exploration Fund and the exploration of the future.

Dr. J. G. Frazer, author of *The Golden Bough, a Study in Magic and Religion*, has published a volume of *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship* (Macmillan, 1905, pp. 309), which treats of the sacred character and magical functions of kings in early society.

In his volume on *Greece from the Coming of the Hellenes to A. D. 14*, in the "Story of the Nations" series (Putnam's), Dr. E. S. Shuckburgh lays stress upon "the political, intellectual, and artistic achievements of the Greeks, rather than on the history of the military operations".

In her book on *Primitive Athens as described by Thucydides* (Cambridge University Press) Dr. Jane E. Harrison of Newnham College sets forth a new view of the character and limits of the ancient city, based upon the ancient literary evidence and the recent excavations of the German Archaeological Institute. Numerous plans and drawings are given in support of her argument.

Mr. H. Stuart Jones, formerly director of the British school at Rome, has attempted to give a popular presentation of the results of recent research in his volume on *The Roman Empire, B. C. 29-A. D. 476*, which will be issued in the "Story of the Nations" series (Putnam's).

In a volume entitled *Studies in Roman History* (Macmillan, 1906, pp. viii, 349) Dr. E. G. Hardy, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, has reprinted with a few alterations his *Christianity and the Roman Government*, essays on the *Movements of the Legions*, *The Provincial Concilia*, a portion of his introduction to Plutarch's *Lives of Galba and Otho*, and several shorter papers formerly printed in the *Journal of Philology*.

Under the title of *Dio's Rome* (Troy, Parfraet's Book Co., 1905) Dr. H. B. Foster, of Lehigh University, has issued an English translation of the history of Dio Cassius, with introduction, lists of dissertations, recent magazine articles, and notes on Dio, and gleanings from his lost books.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Glotz, *Les Ordales en Grèce* (*Revue Historique*, January-February); V. Henry, *L'Histoire avant l'Histoire: Les Italiotes* (*Revue Bleue*, February 17); G. S. Ramundo, *Nerone e l'Incendio di Roma* (*Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXVIII. fasc. III-IV.).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

*The Ecclesiastical Edicts of the Theodosian Code* is the subject of a recent contribution by Dr. W. K. Boyd to the *Columbia University Studies in History and Economics* (Macmillan, pp. 122). The monograph treats of the conflict between paganism and Christianity; heresy and ecclesiastical institutions; the relation of the church to the social organization of the empire; the episcopal courts and the influence of the ecclesiastical edicts of the code upon early medieval jurisprudence.

*Antipriscilliana: Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen und Texte aus dem Streite gegen Priscillians Irrlehre*, by Dr. K. Künstle (Freiburg, Herder, 1905, pp. xii, 248), throws much new light on a chapter of dogmatic history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. Ermoni, *L'Essénisme* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); Fr. X. Funk, *La Question de l'Agape: un dernier Mot* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January); F. Prat, *Origène et l'Origénisme*, I., *Origène dans l'Origénisme*, II., *L'Origénisme après Origène* (Études, December 5, January 5); M. M. Hassett, *Constantine the Great and the Church* (Catholic University Bulletin, January); Adhémar d'Alès, *Limen Ecclesiae: Note sur l'Antienne Pénitence Publique* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *List of Cartularies (principally French) recently added to the Library of Congress; with some Earlier Accessions* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1905, pp. 30) is arranged alphabetically under names of towns.

A general bibliography of Rome (Rome, Loescher) is being compiled under the direction of E. Calvi. The first volume covers the period 476-1499 and is comprehensive in its scope; it contains indexes of subjects and authors.

The celebrated *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum ex Diversis Codicibus Collectae*, by Boninus Mombritius, will be re-edited by the Benedictines of Solsmes. Subscriptions (60 fr.) should be sent to Dom A. Brunet, Appuldurcombe House, Wroxall, Isle of Wight.

Professor F. Schupfer in his work on *Precarie e Livelli nei Documenti e nelle Leggi dell' Alto Medio Evo* (Torino, 1905) discusses the legal character and the economic bearing of these forms of contract.

The latest volumes in the series of *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum* are *Annales Mettenses Priores* (pp. 119) and a fifth edition of *Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni* (pp. 52) (Hanover, Hahn).

A volume of *Quatrièmes Mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen Âge*, published under the direction of M. A. Luchaire through Alcan, Paris (pp. 235), contains *Annales de la Vie de Joscelin de Vierzi, 57e Evêque de Soissons (1126-1152)*, a critical edition of *Courtois d'Arras*, and a note regarding a new manuscript of the chronicler William of Puy-laurens.

*Der Sachsenspiegel und die Stände der Freien* is the subject of the second volume of Phillip Heck's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stände im Mittelalter* (Halle, Niemeyer).

Two recent publications in the series of *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven* are J. Haller's *England und Rom unter Martin V.* (pp. 60), and Hans Niese's *Zur Geschichte des deutschen Soldritertums in Italien* (Rome, Loescher, pp. 36).

Two works of value on Byzantine history are A. Pernice's *L'Imperatore Eraclio, Saggio di Storia Bizantina* (Florence, Galletti and Cocci, 1905); and Charles Diehl's *Études Byzantines* (Paris, Picard, 1905), of which all but two have already been printed in various journals.

Documentary publications: A. Monaci, *Regesto dell' Abbazia di Sant' Alessio all' Aventino* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXVIII. fasc. III.-IV.); G. Arias, *Per la Storia Economica del Secolo XIV. Comunicazioni d'Archivio ed Osservazioni* (ibid.); Abbé G. Mollat, *Lettres Communes de Jean XXII.*, II. (Paris, Fontemoing, 1905); Plazid Bliemetzrieder, *Abt Ludolf's von Sagan Traktat Soliloquium Schismatis* [1409] (Studien u. Mittheilungen aus dem Benedictiner und dem Cistercienser Orden, 1er trimestre, 1905); Abbé H. Dubrulle, *Bullaire de la Province de Reims sous le Pontificat de Pie II.* (Lille, R. Giard, 1905, pp. x, 259).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Fournier, *Études sur les Fausses Décrétales*, I., *Le But et l'Auteur des Fausses Décrétales* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January); L. Havet, *Que doivent à Charlemagne les Classiques Latins?* (Revue Bleue, February 3); Dom J. M. Besse, *L'Ordre de Cluny et son Gouvernement*, III. (Revue Mabillon, November); St. Thomas Aquinas and Medieval Thought (Dublin Review, January); J. M. Vidal, *Les Derniers Ministres de l'Albigéisme en Languedoc: Leurs Doctrines* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); P. Richard, *Origines des Nonciatures Permanentes: La Représentation Pontificale au XVe Siècle (1450-1513)*, I. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January); L. Delisle, *Vers Français sur une Pratique Usuraire abolie dans le Dauphiné en 1501* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, July-August, 1905).

#### MODERN HISTORY

The first part of the fourth volume of Professor Ludwig Pastor's *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg, Herder, 1906, pp. xviii, 609) treats of the pontificate of Leo X. The second part, on the pontificate of Adrian VI. and Clement VII., will soon be published.

The account of *Christine de Suède et le Conclave de Clément X.* (Paris, Plon-Nourrit) by the Baron de Bildt is based on the correspondence of the French, Spanish, and Venetian diplomats, and on the letters which were daily exchanged between Cardinal Azzolino and Queen Christina, and which throw light on the customs of the sixteenth century. Many documents are appended.

H. Nagaoka, attaché of the Japanese Legation at Paris, has written a *Histoire des Relations du Japon avec l'Europe aux XVIe et XVIIe Siècles* (Paris, Jouve, 326 pp.), which includes an introductory sketch of Japanese history, and some original Japanese documents and reports of Japanese officials at European courts.

The first volume of *Les Sources Inédites de l'Histoire du Maroc* (Paris, Leroux) by le Comte Henry de Castries is a comprehensive collection from the archives and libraries of France, England, Austria,

Spain, and other countries of unpublished documents relating to the history of Morocco from 1530 to 1845.

A volume by I. P. Dengel on *Die politische und kirchliche Tätigkeit des Mons. Josef Garampi in Deutschland (1761-1763)* (Rome, Loescher, 1905, pp. 196) deals with the Peace Congress in Augsburg, and the suspension of the abbot of the monastery of Salem and his new investiture by Garampi; it includes an index of the sources in the Vatican archives for the history of European peace congresses from that of Westphalia to 1763, and letters of Maria Theresa and of Clement XIII.

A publication that should be of great value to students of international law and diplomacy is the *Recueil des Arbitrages Internationaux* (vol. I., 1798-1855) (Paris, Pedone, 1905), in which MM. de Lapradelle and Politis set forth the history of each arbitration with the most important texts and an analysis of the memorials presented. Analytical, chronological, and alphabetical indexes are included.

Documentary publications: Schornbaum, *Zur Geschichte des Reichstages von Augsburg im Jahre 1530* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1er trim., 1905) [appendix to report of the delegates of Nuremberg and a writing of Melanchthon]; K. Graebert, *Konsilium für den 1531 zu Speier angesetzten Reichstag* (ibid.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Braig, *Der Friedensplan des Leibniz* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXVI. 4); Comte d'Hauterive, *Rapports à S. M. l'Empereur sur les Affaires de Rome (1809-1810)* (Revue Bleue, December 2, 9, and 16); E. Rossier, *L'Affaire de Savoie en 1860 et l'Intervention Anglaise* (Revue Historique, January-February).

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Methuen and Company have recently published *The Student's Historical and Modern Atlas of the British Empire*, containing sixty-four maps and edited by Mr. C. G. Robertson, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford, and Mr. J. G. Bartholomew, F. R. G. S. The volume includes historical and modern maps, physical maps, commercial maps and diagrams, and a historical gazetteer and bibliography.

A new book by the late Bishop Stubbs, entitled *Lectures on Early English History*, edited by Arthur Hassall, M.A., has been recently published by Longmans. Some of the lectures contain elucidations of difficult passages in Stubbs's *Select Charters*.

An annotated translation of Asser's *Life of King Alfred* (pp. viii, 83), made from the text of Mr. W. H. Stevenson's edition by Professor Albert S. Cook of Yale University and published by Ginn and Company, presents in convenient form a valuable document whose authenticity is now generally conceded.

A complete record from the earliest time to the present of the knights of all the orders of chivalry in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Knights Bachelors, has been compiled by Dr. William A. Shaw

in two large volumes entitled *The Knights of England*, which will be published by Sherratt and Hughes for the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, Lord Chamberlain's Office, St. James's Palace. Hitherto such a work has been impossible because some of the most important sources from which it must be derived were closed to investigators. Mr. Shaw, however, has been granted access to all the official records. The lists of knights dubbed in Ireland has been compiled from the records in Dublin Castle, by Mr. G. B. D. Burtchaell.

Mr. N. T. Hone's *The Manor and Manorial Records*, which includes examples of the various classes of records, and many illustrations, facsimiles, plans, and views, has been issued in the series of "Antiquary's Books" (Methuen, pp. 376).

Professor Charles Gross in an article on the Court of Piepowder, in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for February, urges the exploiting of early English archives for data concerning this court, not only because of its wide-spread and long-continued activity, but also because "the careful investigation of its history will throw needed light on the organization of medieval commerce".

The first volume of *The Records of the City of Norwich*, which date back to the twelfth century, has been compiled under the expert editorship of Reverend W. Hudson and Mr. J. C. Tingey, and is published by Jarrold, London. The work will be complete in two volumes.

The *Chronicles of London*, edited with introduction, notes, and glossary by C. L. Kingsford and published by the Clarendon Press (1905, pp. 368), are three fifteenth-century chronicles in English, hitherto unpublished, which form the foundation on which Fabyan, Hall, Holinshed, and others have built.

In *A History of the Post-Reformation Catholic Missions in Oxfordshire with an Account of the Families Connected with them* (London, Frowde, 1906, pp. 371), Mrs. Bryan Stapleton has attempted to trace the descent of the older Catholic Missions in the country from the latter days of Queen Elizabeth. The history of the various parishes is considered separately, and much original material is included.

David Loggan's *Cantabrigia Illustrata* (Macmillan), a series of views of the university and colleges and of Eton College, first published in 1690, has been edited with a life of Loggan, an introduction, and historical descriptive notes by Mr. J. W. Clark, the learned Registry of the University of Cambridge.

M. Paul Mantoux's *La Révolution Industrielle au XVIIIe Siècle* (Paris, Cornély, 1906, pp. 502) contains an extended discussion of the economic antecedents of the revolution, of the general inventions and industrial enterprises, and of the immediate consequences of the revolution. The book includes a number of maps, and a classified and critical bibliography of over thirty pages.



The centenary of William Pitt's death in January of this year has been appropriately marked by the appearance of a new biography of the statesman written by Charles Whibley, and published by Blackwood (pp. 354).

Professor G. M. Wrong's life of *The Earl of Elgin* (London, Methuen, 1905, pp. vii, 300) is largely based on material not used by Lord Elgin's former biographers, and is an attempt to show the significance of his career in Canada and in the East, especially in Japan.

Recent volumes in the *Victoria History of the Counties of England* (London, Constable) relate to the counties of Durham, Derby, and Sussex.

Mr. Murray announces the publication of an abridged *Official Account of the Second Afghan War, 1878-1880*.

British government publications: *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office*, vol. V.; *Calendar of Patent Rolls: Edward III., 1348-1350*; *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, N. S., 1599-1600; *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, vol. XX.; *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Elizabeth, 1 Nov., 1600-31 July, 1601*; *Calendar of State Papers, Venice, 1610-1613*; *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland preserved at Belvoir Castle*, vol. IV.

Other documentary publications: F. W. Maitland, *Year Books of Edward II.*, vol. III., 3 Edward II., 1309-1310 [Selden Society, vol. XX.] (London, Quaritch, pp. xciv, 244); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London: Letter-Book G., 1352-1374* (printed by order of the Corporation); F. J. C. Hearnshaw and D. M. Hearnshaw, *Southampton Court Lect Records, 1550-1577*, vol. I., part I. [Southampton Record Society] (Southampton, Gilbert, pp. 23); F. Collins, *Wills and Administrations from the Knaresborough Court Rolls* [Surtees Society, vol. CX.] (Durham, Andrews, 1905); C. B. Gunn, *Records of the Baron Court of Stitchill, 1655-1807* [Scottish History Society, vol. I.] (Edinburgh, 1905, pp. xxxix, 248).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. F. Baldwin, *Antiquities of the King's Council* (English Historical Review, January); Sir C. P. Ilbert, *The History of English Parliamentary Procedure* (Contemporary Review, January); Hume Brown, *The Scottish Nobility and their Part in the National History* (Scottish Historical Review, January); Andrew Lang, *Portraits and Jewels of Mary Stuart* (Scottish Historical Review, January); W. C. Abbott, *The Long Parliament of Charles II.*, I. (English Historical Review, January); H. Bingham, *The Early History of the Scots Darien Company* (Scottish Historical Review, January); J. F. Chance, *The Mission of Fabrice to Sweden, 1717-1718* (English Historical Review, January); Graham Wallas, *From the Second to the Third Reform Bill* (Independent Review, February); P. Thureau-Dan-



gin, *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au Dix-Neuvième Siècle*, I., Manning à l'Archevêché de Westminster, II., Manning et Newman (Le Correspondant, January 10 and 25); E. E. Kellett, *Mr. Justin M'Carthy's "History of Our Own Times"* (London Quarterly Review, January).

## FRANCE

The last volume of the *Répertoire Méthodique de l'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine de la France*, compiled under the direction of G. Brière and P. Caron, and published by the Société d'Histoire Moderne through É. Cornély in 1905, is a well-classified and indexed list of the books and articles on French history after 1500 which appeared in the year 1903. The sections on the history of the sciences, literary history, and the history of art include the publications of 1902 as well as of the following year. The total number of titles is nearly 6,000. Critical reviews are noted.

Reports of the sessions of the special Commission on Libraries and Archives appear regularly in *La Révolution Française*. The subcommission on archives is considering the relation of the autonomous archives of Foreign Affairs, War, Colonies, and Marine to the National Archives, and brief reports of visits of the commissioners to the autonomous archives are printed in the January number of the journal. The February number contains a report by M. Aulard on the personnel of archivists.

*Monuments* of the history of the Abbeys of Saint-Philibert have been edited in a most thorough and scholarly manner from the notes of M. A. Giry by M. R. Poupardin, as one of the series of *Textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'Histoire* (Paris, Picard, 1905, pp. 137). The volume includes four narrative texts dating from the ninth to the eleventh centuries and a list of the diplomas of the Carolingian kings and of the bulls relating to the abbeys. The texts contain an account of the life of this seventh-century saint, his interment in his monastery in the island of Noirmoutier, the incursions of the Normans, the building of a new monastery on the mainland at Grandlieu, the removal of the saint's body thither, and the miracles wrought on the crowds that thronged to touch the bier, the progress of the Normans up the valley of the Loire, and the forced retirement of the monks from place to place across Poitou and Auvergne until in 875 they found a permanent residence at Tournus in Burgundy.

Two recent important additions to the series of the publications of the Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, Renouard) are *Lettres de Louis XI. (1481-1482)*, edited by J. Vaesen, and *Mémoriaux du Conseil de 1661*, edited by J. de Boislisle. Another publication of a kind different from those hitherto published by the society is *Rapports et Notices sur l'Édition des Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu*.

The work of the Commission on the Economic History of the French Revolution may be followed in the reports of its sessions printed in *La Révolution Française*. The December number of this journal contains an *aperçu* of the forthcoming volume of documents relative to the committee on feudal rights and the abolition of the seigniorial régime (1789-1793); and a circular issued by the Minister of Public Instruction which sets forth the rules to be followed in the editing of the dossiers of the sale of national property. It is now proposed to publish the *procès-verbaux* of the committee of agriculture for the period of the Legislative Assembly and of the Convention as well as for that of the Constituent Assembly, and also to publish the unique cahiers drawn up in 1789 by the corporations of Marseilles, and a collection of documents relating to industry in the department of Vaucluse from 1789 to 1800.

An important study on poor-relief during the period of the great republican assemblies is the volume by M. Ferdinand-Dreyfus entitled *L'Assistance sous la Législative et la Convention (1791-1795)* (Paris, Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1905).

A catalogue of the collection of autographs, broadsides, drawings, maps, and other historical documents relating to Napoleon I. and his times, formed by Mr. A. M. Broadley, has been published by Mr. W. V. Daniell under the title *Collectanea Napoleonica*.

Professor Max Lenz has added a new volume entitled *Napoleon*, containing more than one hundred illustrations, to the series of *Mono-graphien zur Weltgeschichte* (Leipzig, Velhagen, 1905, pp. 199).

A source-book for the use of the upper classes of lycées and normal schools has recently been compiled by L. Cahen and A. Mathiez and published under the title *Les Lois Françaises de 1815 à nos Jours* (Paris, Alcan, 1906, pp. xvi, 312).

J. Tchernoff's work entitled *Associations et Sociétés Secrètes sous la Deuxième République (1848-1851)* (Paris, Alcan, 1905, pp. 396) contains many documents hitherto unpublished relative to the republican societies of the period.

M. Paul Sabatier has written a book, *A propos de la Séparation des Églises et de l'État*, which may be had for one franc from the Librairie Fischbacher. A translation by Mr. R. Dell will be published by Mr. Unwin under the title *Disestablishment in France* and will include a special preface by the author, an introduction by the translator, and the full text of the separation law, with explanatory notes.

The *Guardian* will publish Mr. Bodley's two recent lectures at the Royal Institution on the Church in France.

Documentary publications: Sébastien Locatelli, prêtre bolonais, *Voyage de France: Mœurs et Coutumes Françaises (1664-1665)*, Bibliothèque de la Société des Études Historiques, fasc. iv. [translation, introduction, and notes by A. Vautier] (Paris, Picard, 1905, pp. lxxiv, 349); Simon Gruget, *Histoire de la Constitution Civile du Clergé en Anjou* [Memoirs of the Revolutionary Period, published by F. Uzureau]

(Paris, Picard, 1905, pp. 235); A. de Saint-Léger and P. Sagnac, *Les Cahiers de la Flandre Maritime en 1789, publiés avec une Introduction et des Notes*, vol. I. (Paris, Picard, 1906, pp. liv, 472).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Camille Jullian, *La Vie et l'Étude des Monuments Français*, I, II. (Revue Bleue, January 6 and 13); J. Viard, *La Chronique de Jean le Bel et la Chronographia Regum Francorum* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, September-October); L. Davillé, *Le "Pagus Scarponensis"*, I. (Annales de l'Est et du Nord, January); M. Juselin, *Notes Tironiennes dans les Diplomes* [with plate] (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, July-August, 1905); René Poupardin, *Notes Carolingiennes*, I., *Un Nouveau Manuscrit des Annales de Saint-Bertin* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, July-August, 1905); J. Finot, *La Paix d'Arras (1414-1415)*, I. [Pièces justificatives, pp. 61-80] (Annales de l'Est et du Nord, January); J. B. J. Ayroles, *La Vénérable Jeanne d'Arc, Prophétisée et Prophétesse* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); V. Carrière, *Nicole Tilhart, Secrétaire et Général des Finances de Louis XI.* (Le Moyen Âge, July-August); Ch. de Calan, *La Bretagne au XVIe Siècle* (Revue de Bretagne, August, September, October); P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Origines de la Réforme.—Le Gallicanisme et la Restauration Papale. La Préparation du Concordat de 1516* (Le Correspondant, November 25); J. Nouaillac, *La Fin de la Ligue, Villeroy Négociateur des Politiques: Essai d'Histoire des Négociations de 1589 à 1594* (Revue Henri IV., September-October); L. Delisle, *Les Heures de Blanche de France, Duchesse d'Orléans* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, September-October); M. Dumoulin, *Qui a composé les Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu?* (Revue Bleue, January 6); Andrew D. White, *The Statesmanship of Turgot* (Atlantic, February and March); *Religion under the French Revolution* (Edinburgh Review, January); P. Sagnac, *Les Comités des Droits Féodaux et de Législation et l'Abolition du Régime Seigneurial* (La Révolution Française, December); A. Tuetey, *L'Église Constitutionnelle de Paris et les Communautés Religieuses en 1791 et 1792* (La Révolution Française, December-January); P. Sagnac, *Le Concordat de 1817: Étude des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État sous la Restauration, 1814-1821*, I., II. (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, December, January); M. Poëte, *Les Sources de l'Histoire de Paris et les Historiens de Paris*, II. (Revue Bleue, November 18 and 25).

#### ITALY AND SPAIN

*Les Rapports de la France avec l'Italie du XIIe Siècle à la Fin du Premier Empire, d'après la Série K des Archives Nationales* (Paris, Champion, 1905, pp. 165) is one volume of a series projected by the Abbé E. Sol, which will contain inventories of documents in archives relating to the history of Italy. Extracts from the texts are included.

The *Athenaeum* of February 3 contains an account by G. Biagi of some of the more important recent Italian historical publications.

Among the books noted are the reissue of Pompeo Molmenti's masterpiece, *Storia di Venezia nella Vita Privata*, which has been entirely recast. The work will be translated by Mr. Horatio F. Brown and will be published by McClurg, Chicago. Among other works on the Middle Ages are B. Capasso's *Napoli Greco-Romana esposta nella Topografia e nella Vita*, a new edition of P. Villari's *First Two Centuries of the History of Florence*, and Saverio la Sorsa's *L'Organizzazione dei Cambiatori Fiorentini nel Medio Evo*. L. Pullè has reviewed the military, religious, and knightly orders of the world in his work *Dalle Crociate a Oggi*, and G. Berthelet has published *Rivelazioni e Storia del Conclave del 1903: L'Elezione di Pio X*.

The third number of the *Archivio Muratoriano* (Città di Castello, Scipione Lapi, 1906), the organ of the new edition of Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, contains a monograph by P. Torelli on the Milanese chronicle *Flos Florum*, notes relative to manuscripts of original narratives relating to Italian history, to the progress made in editing the collection, etc.

On the occasion of the Tenth International Congress of Navigation the Ministry of Marine of the Italian government published a *Monografia Storica dei Porti dell'Antichità nella Penisola Italiana* (Rome, Officina Poligrafica Italiana, 1905, pp. vii, 398).

Professor G. Bonolis in his monograph *I Titoli di Nobiltà nell'Italia Bizantina* (Florence, Seeber, 1905, pp. 85) traces in an interesting manner the history of titles of nobility from the time of the Roman Republic to the eleventh century, giving most space to the period of Byzantine rule. He shows how the changing character of titles was the outcome of altered social, political, and economic conditions. With the development of the state the aristocracy of blood yielded to the aristocracy of public office, and when the crumbling state could no longer control its powerful officials and wealthy citizens, aristocracy came to be based upon the possession of the prevalent form of individual wealth—land. The titles of *Dux* and *Comes* are discussed with special fullness.

In his valuable work on the *Sistema della Costituzione Economica e Sociale Italiana nell'Età dei Comuni* (Rome, Roux and Viarengo, 1905) Professor G. Arias devotes a chapter to papal finance.

Much light is thrown not only upon the Venetian craft-gilds but also upon the general life of the city of Venice by the second volume, parts 1 and 2, of *I Capitolari delle Arti Veneziane* by Signor Giovanni Monticolo published under the direction of the Italian Historical Institute of Rome, 1905.

In his study *Zur Entstehung des Kapitalismus in Venedig* (Berlin, J. G. Cotta, 1905, pp. 129) [Münchener Volkswirtschaftliche Studien], R. Heynen endeavors to prove that the wealth of Venice was derived from trade, and not, as Sombart has argued in his *Der moderne Kapi-*

talismus, from other sources. Two eleventh-century documents from Venetian archives are included.

Father Paschal Robinson, F. M., has translated into English with an introduction and notes *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi* (Philadelphia, Dolphin Press, 1906). The translation of the Latin writings is based upon the critical Quaracchi edition of the text, but the writings that are not in Latin are also translated in this volume.

Professor Nino Tamassia's book on *S. Francesco d'Assisi e la sua Leggenda* (Padua, Drucker) contains some revolutionary criticism of the sources.

Mr. Fisher Unwin is to publish a new volume of *Historical and Critical Essays* by Professor P. Villari, dealing mainly with the Italian Renaissance.

The thirteenth volume of the *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia* (Madrid, Tello, pp. ix, 976) contains a prize essay by F. I. Simonet entitled "Historia de los Mozárabes de España deducida de los Mejores y más Auténticos Testimonios de los Escritores Cristianos y Arabes."

The first of the four volumes of Dr. Henry C. Lea's new work entitled *A History of the Inquisition of Spain* has recently been published by Macmillan. It rests on a vast mass of documents from Spanish archives, some of which are included in an appendix, and treats of the origin and establishment of the tribunal and of its relations with the state.

The third and final volume of R. Altamira's *Historia de España y de la Civilización Española* (Barcelona, J. Gili) was announced for publication at the beginning of this year.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Rodríguez Villa, *Correspondencia de la Infanta Archiduquesa Doña Isabel Clara Eugenia de Austria con el Duque de Lerma* (desde Flandes, años 1599 á 1607 y otras cartas posteriores sin feca) [con.] (Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia, November); R. Reuss, *Le Général Dupont et la Capitulation de Baylen, d'après un Ouvrage Récent* (Revue Historique, January-February).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

A contribution to medieval historiography is made by H. Schneider in his monograph on *Das kausale Denken in deutschen Quellen zur Geschichte und Literatur des zehnten, elften und zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Gotha, Perthes, 1905).

Lectures delivered by Professor Felix Dahn in the summer of 1904 at the Salzburg *Historikertag* and forming a brief epitome of his voluminous works have been collected into a volume entitled *Die Germanen: Volkstümliche Darstellungen aus Geschichte, Recht, Wirtschaft und Kultur* (Leipzig, Breitkopf and Härtel, 1905, pp. viii, 116).

The first volume of A. Werninghoff's *Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im Mittelalter* (Hanover, Hahn, 1905, pp. vii, 301) summarizes what is known on this subject. It begins with the constitution of the church in the Roman period and ends with the beginning of the Reformation.

A series of *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Stadtverfassung* has been opened by an important book by the editor of the series, Professor Rietschel, entitled *Das Burggrafenamt und die hohe Gerichtsbarkeit in den deutschen Bischofsstädten während des früheren Mittelalters* (Leipzig, Veit, 1905, pp. xii, 344).

A contribution to the history of thought in the Middle Ages is Dr. J. Schmidlin's *Die geschichtsphilosophische und kirchenpolitische Weltanschauung Ottos von Freising* (Freiburg, Herder, pp. vii, xii, 168) in the series of *Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* under the direction of the Görres Gesellschaft.

The fifth and latest volume in Ludwig Pastor's *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* is Dr. W. van Gulik's *Johannes Gropper (1503-1559)*, a contribution to the church history of Germany, especially of the Rhineland in the sixteenth century (Freiburg, Herder, pp. 278).

The twelfth and closing volume of the highly interesting series of *Monographien zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte* is Paul Drew's *Der Evangelische Geistliche in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Jena, Diederichs, 1905, pp. 145). It includes over a hundred illustrations, mostly from wood and copper engravings of the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. A general index and atlas to the series will shortly be issued.

In the bulletin of the *Revue Historique* of January-February M. Philppson treats of the writings of the year 1904 relating to the history of modern Germany.

A prize work by E. Schaunkell entitled *Geschichte der deutschen Kulturgeschichtsschreibung von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zur Romantik in Zusammenhang mit der allgemeinen geistigen Entwicklung* has been published by Teubner, Leipzig.

A new collection of Bismarck letters, dating from the time when he represented Prussia in Frankfurt, is to be edited by H. von Poschinger and published by E. Trewendt, Berlin.

Dr. Vancsa has brought out the first volume of a *Geschichte Nieder- und Oboesterreichs* (Gotha, pp. 646). Much attention is paid to economic conditions and to the history of civilization as well as to political history. The book covers the period from pre-Roman times to the year 1283.

The second volume of the *Forschungen zur inneren Geschichte Oesterreichs*, entitled *Das oesterreichische Landrecht und die böhmischen Einwirkungen auf die Reformen König Ottokars in Oesterreich* (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1905, pp. 154), is by Dr. M. Stieber.

A new volume in the illustrated series *Weltgeschichte in Charakterbildern* (München, Kirchheim) is on *Die Begründung der Grossmachtstellung Oesterreich-Ungarns: Prinz Eugen*. The author is K. von Landmann.

Professor I. Goll continues his discussion of writings on Bohemia published between 1899 and 1904 in the historical bulletin of the *Revue Historique* of January-February.

The second volume of A. Bachmann's *Geschichte Böhmens* (Gotha, Perthes), which has been published in the Heeren and Ukert series of national histories, covers the period from 1378 to 1516.

The fifth volume of the *Monumenta Vaticana Res Gestas Bohemicas Illustrantia* contains the *Acta Urbani VI. et Bonifatii IX.*, part 2, 1397-1404 (Prague, Rivnác).

The review by M. V. van Berchem of publications relating to the historical sources of the history of medieval Switzerland is concluded in the bulletin of the *Revue Historique* of January-February.

Professor J. M. Vincent's paper on *Municipal Problems in Mediæval Switzerland*, an abstract of which was printed in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1902, I. 213-221, has been issued in extended form in the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXIII., nos. 11-12 (pp. 32).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Tumbült, *Wie wurde Elsass französisch?*, II. (*Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXVI. 4); A. Hofmeister, *Rostocker Studentenleben vom 15. bis ins 19. Jahrhundert*, I. (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, IV. 1); R. Koser, *Brandenburg-Preussen in dem Kampfe zwischen Imperialismus und reichsständischer Libertät* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, XCVI. 2); P. Haake, *Die Wahl Augusts des Starken zum König von Polen* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, February); P. Matter, *Bismarck à l'Exposition de 1867* (*Revue Bleue*, December 2); H. Welschinger, *La Diplomatie Allemande de 1870 à 1890* (*Revue Bleue*, January 6).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Professor T. Bussemaker of the University of Leyden, who was entrusted by the Netherlands government with researches in the principal archives of Spain and Portugal for documentary material relating to the history of the Netherlands, has published his report under the title *Verslag van een voorloopig onderzoek te Lissabon, Sevilla, Madrid, Escorial, Simancas en Brussel naar Archivalia, belangrijk voor de Geschiedenis van Nederland* (La Haye, Stockum, pp. viii, 207).

MM. Misch and Thron of Brussels announce for publication a collection entitled *Codices Belgici Selecti: Fac-similes des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Belges*. The manuscripts will be reproduced in phototype and will be edited under the general direction of Father J. Van den Gheyn, of the Section of Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Royale. Volumes now in preparation are the homilies of St. Cesarius of Arles, a

seventh-century manuscript of "lives of the fathers", etc., *Jehan Bras de Fer de Donmartin and Pamphile et Galatée*, a fourteenth-century manuscript.

M. II. Pirenne traces the history of the woollen industry in Flanders from the thirteenth century in his monograph entitled *Une Crise Industrielle au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle: La Draperie Urbaine et la Nouvelle Draperie en Flandre* (Brussels, 1905, pp. 35).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

All the papal acts relating to the history of Denmark for two centuries before the Reformation are to be published by L. Moltesen under the title *Acta Pontificum Danica* (1316-1536) (Copenhagen, Gad). The first volume includes the text or the analysis of documents relating to the Avignon period.

R. Waultrin writes on "Un Siècle d'Union Suédo-Norvégienne et la Fondation du Royaume de Norvège" in *Annales des Sciences Politiques* for January.

#### AMERICA

##### GENERAL ITEMS

The *Suggestions for the Printing of Documents relating to American History* mentioned on a previous page (p. 510) as having been presented by the Historical Manuscripts Commission at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, have been printed in a separate leaflet, in advance of publication in the Association's annual volume; copies can be had by applying to J. F. Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

From henceforth the United States will be regularly represented in the *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft*, the annual account of historical writings to be contributed by Mr. W. G. Leland of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The report to appear in the next volume will include the writings for 1904 and 1905.

We are glad to note the publication of part III. of the catalogue of *State Publications*, edited by R. R. Bowker. In this volume of over six hundred pages are included the publications of the states and territories west of the Mississippi, including Alaska and Hawaii, but exclusive of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, which belong to the group of southern states to be covered in part IV. The compilation of the present volume has been performed by Mr. W. N. Seaver.

A complete index to the *Magazine of American History*, 1877-1893, is to be published by William Abbatt. It will be a subscription volume of about 350 pages.

The October and November issues of the *Magazine of History* have just appeared. Among the articles worthy of special note are "The



British Navy in the Revolution", by R. P. Bolton, "Sullivan's Great March into the Indian Country", by W. E. Griffis, commencing in the November number, and a number of documents, including letters of Washington, John Dickinson, James McHenry, and Edmund Munro.

A new magazine devoted to general American history and genealogy has been inaugurated, the *American Historical Magazine* (Publishing Society of New York). It is a bimonthly, appearing on the fifteenth of January, March, May, July, September, and November. The first number contains "The Board of Proprietors of East New Jersey", by Cortlandt Parker, "The Morris Family of Morrisania", by W. W. Spooner, "The Fur Trade in the Early Development of the Northwest", by Henry M. Utley, "Early New England Exploration of our North Pacific Coast: the Columbia River", by Horace S. Lyman, and "The Charter and Constitution of Connecticut", by Lynde Harrison. The new periodical promises to fill a distinct place among historical publications; its scope is wider than that of magazines devoted to local history, and it can print articles which are not sufficiently special for professional magazines, yet which are not sufficiently general for the literary or popular periodicals.

It is announced that Dr. Francis N. Thorpe, formerly professor of American constitutional history in the University of Pennsylvania, has been associated with Dr. Guy Carleton Lee as joint editor-in-chief of the *History of North America*, hitherto edited by the latter. The circular which conveys this information attributes to the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW the following general commendation of that series: "Will have a permanent value as an encyclopedia . . . worth the reading of historian and layman alike." In a notice of the first four volumes of the work a reviewer in this journal (X. 377) said of Mr. Thomas's *The Indians of North America*, the second volume of that series, after commenting on its deficiencies as a history, "The book will have a permanent value as an encyclopedia of Indian tribes and wars". Some distance below, speaking of Mr. Hamilton's *The Colonization of the South*, he characterizes it as "a book worth the reading of historian and layman alike." We do not think it needful to comment upon the process by which the general commendation we have quoted above was evolved from these materials.

J. W. Garner and H. C. Lodge are collaborating in the preparation of *The History of the United States* (Philadelphia, J. D. Morris and Company). The first two volumes, bringing the narrative to the close of Van Buren's administration, have appeared, and are bountifully illustrated, albeit many of the pictures are of the imaginative type. The work is professedly for popular consumption, not for the historical specialist. The chapters dealing with the Revolution are a condensation of Mr. Lodge's *Story of the Revolution*.

Two text-books for elementary schools, somewhat similar in scope and plan, have recently appeared: *The Making of the American Nation*,

by J. W. Redway (Silver, Burdett), and *School History of the United States*, by H. W. Elson (Macmillan).

*American Literature in History* (Ginn and Company, 1905), by Martha A. Lane and Mabel Hill, is a compilation for use in elementary schools, of "a number of simple literary excerpts which illustrate the leading events and the characteristic conditions that have marked the development of the United States". Undoubtedly such selections will aid in fixing events and making them stand out with greater vividness in the mind of the pupil. There is, however, the probable danger that merely picturesque events, and unhistorical aspects of these, will be thus overemphasized.

The Historical Publishing Company of Topeka, Kansas, has put forth a volume of *Forty Maps Illustrating United States History* compiled by E. G. Foster.

The Bureau of American Ethnology has published (Bulletin 29) *Haida Texts and Myths*, recorded by John R. Swanton. They are in the Skidegate dialect, and were obtained on the Queen Charlotte Islands in British Columbia.

The twenty-third annual report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, which we have recently received, is accompanied by a six-hundred-page account of *The Zuñi Indians, their Mythology, Esoteric Fraternities, and Ceremonies*, by Mrs. Matilda Coxe Stevenson. The work, abundantly illustrated, is based upon observations made during a long period of residence among the Zuñi, and deals with religion, social customs, history, arts and industries, medical practices, etc.

A beautifully printed little volume is produced by the Burrows Brothers in their *Narratives of Indian Captivities: Incidents Attending the Capture, Detention, and Ransom of Charles Johnston of Virginia*, reprinted from the original edition of 1827, with introduction and editorial notes by Edwin Erle Sparks. Johnston, a Virginia attorney, was captured in 1790 during a journey to the Kentucky country, and was carried north to the Indian village of Upper Sandusky, where he was ransomed by an Indian trader and taken to Detroit. He did not write the account of his experiences, however, until thirty-five years later.

In the December and February numbers of the *German American Annals* are continuations of the list of articles relating to Germany in American periodicals; the January issue contains another instalment of the Moravian diary of travel, previously described in these pages.

*A History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, by Father Thomas Hughes, is announced by Longmans, Green, and Company. The first two volumes will cover the years to 1645. The whole work is expected to consist of eight. It promises to be of the highest authority.

A fourth edition of Thomas's *History of the Friends in America*, revised and enlarged by A. C. Thomas, has been put forth by the J. C. Winston Company.

Mr. M. A. De Wolfe Howe is preparing to publish the *Life and Letters of George Bancroft*. All the material in the possession of the Bancroft family has been placed in his hands, and he is anxious to see all letters of important bearing on Bancroft's life and work. Manuscripts sent to him will be promptly copied and returned. His address is 26 Brimmer Street, Boston.

The autobiography of General Lew Wallace is announced for early publication by the Harpers.

#### ITEMS CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED

It was expected that the first two volumes of the series entitled *Original Narratives of Early American History*, edited by Dr. J. F. Jameson, would be issued this spring. Delays have however occurred. It is now intended to issue the first three volumes in the autumn. The first two have already been described in these pages. The third, of which the special editor is Dr. Henry S. Burrage of Maine, will embrace narratives of the early English voyages, taken mostly from Hakluyt, and preceded by Hakluyt's Cartier texts—the narratives of Hore, Hawkins, Drake, Haies (Gilbert), Barlow, Lane, White, Brereton, Pring, and Rosier, and the *Relation of a Voyage to Sagadahoc*. The fourth volume, edited by Mr. W. L. Grant of Toronto, and published in the spring of 1907, will contain Champlain's *Voyages*, editions of 1613 and 1619. The fifth volume, devoted to narratives of early Virginia, will be edited by President Lyon G. Tyler of the College of William and Mary. It will contain Percy's *Observations*, Smith's *True Relation*, his *Map and Proceedings*, the fourth book of his *Generall Historie*, Delaware's *Relation*, the journal of the Assembly of 1619, letters of Molina, Biard, Rolfe, and Pory, the Answer of the Old Planters, the Tragical Relation of the Virginia Assembly, and the Discourse of the Old Company. Bradford's *History of Plimoth Plantation* will constitute Vol. VI.

E. Grant Richards (London) expects to publish in the fall a *Life and Account of the Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, in preparation by Mr. Filson Young. Mr. Young is desirous to have the co-operation of persons who may possess material relating to Columbus.

An important work, announced some time ago, has been published by Dodd, Mead, and Company: *A Memoir of Jacques Cartier*, by James Phinney Baxter. This volume contains a new translation from the original French of Cartier's *Voyages* in 1535-1536 and 1541, and the first translation of the manuscript, discovered in 1867 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, of the voyage of 1534. A bibliography and a collection of all the pertinent documents thus far discovered in the French and Spanish archives are included, as well as an exhaustive memoir of Cartier.

The second volume of Avery's *History of the United States* (Burrows Brothers) deals with the period from 1600 to 1660. The pub-

lishers announce that the plan of the work has been enlarged, and that fifteen volumes will be published instead of the twelve as at first announced. Volumes III and IV are expected to follow shortly.

The bicentenary of Franklin's birth is responsible for a considerable output respecting him. His autobiography has been reprinted in several editions, some of which have already been noted. Another, inexpensive in form, has been published by Longmans, Green, and Company, while an illustrated, limited edition is announced by Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. Three *Old South Leaflets*, Nos. 161-163, have been recently issued, being respectively selections from the autobiography relative to Franklin's boyhood, his "Letters on War and Peace", and his "Plan for Western Colonies". The *Independent* for January 11 is devoted to Franklin and contains articles bearing on the various aspects of his life, character, and achievements, by John Bigelow, John W. Foster, E. E. Hale, W. C. Ford, A. H. Smyth, and others. The Franklin papers acquired about two years ago by the University of Pennsylvania are described in the *Outlook* for January 20, and also in the *Alumni Register* of the University of Pennsylvania for February-March, which latter periodical contains also an article on "Franklin and the University". A complete calendar of the collection has been prepared by Mr. A. C. Boggess, which it is hoped can be published in the near future. Finally should be mentioned the fourth volume of Professor Smyth's edition of *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, which has just appeared, covering the years 1760-1766.

*The Correspondence of William Pitt, while Secretary of State, with Colonial Governors and Military and Naval Commanders in America*, prepared from the manuscripts in the Public Record Office at the charge of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, and edited by Miss Gertrude S. Kimball, is now ready for printing, in two volumes octavo. The publication will embrace nearly five hundred letters, and will make a signal addition to the material for the history of the French and Indian War.

The British War Office has acquired the four important volumes of manuscript copies or extracts of Orders, Returns, and Capitulations relating to the Revolutionary War which Messrs. Hodgson discovered when cataloguing the books from the library of the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

The second volume of *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, edited by H. A. Cushing (Putnam's, 1906), has just been issued. It covers the years 1770-1773.

*Americans of 1776*, by James Schouler (Dodd, Mead, and Company), is "an original study of life and manners, social, industrial and political, for the revolutionary period". It comprises in substance occasional lectures given at Johns Hopkins University during the years 1901-1905.

Under the title of *Letters and Recollections of Washington*, Doubleday, Page, and Company are publishing Washington's correspondence with Tobias Lear, together with Lear's diary covering the last years of Washington's life.

Professor W. E. Dodd of Randolph-Macon College and Mr. W. G. Leland of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution have undertaken to collect and publish the writings and correspondence of John Marshall. Inasmuch as there is no single large collection, so far as is known, of Marshall papers, in existence, it is necessary that an extensive search should be made, particularly among the papers of Marshall's contemporaries. The compilers earnestly hope that persons having in their possession any material bearing on the life and writings of the Chief Justice will be willing to communicate either with Professor Dodd at Ashland, Virginia, or with Mr. Leland, at the Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

The two most recent additions to Professor Hart's *American Nation* are *The Federalist System, 1789-1801*, by John Spencer Bassett, and Edward Channing's *Jeffersonian Democracy, 1801-1811*.

We have received a reprint of Dunlop's *Recollections of the American War, 1812-1814* (Toronto, Historical Publishing Company), prefaced with a biographical sketch of the author by A. H. V. Colquhoun. Dr. William Dunlop was a Scotchman who was attached to the Connaught Rangers as surgeon and engaged in the campaigns of 1812-1814 along the Canadian border.

Four of the British war-vessels sunk in the Battle of Lake Erie have recently been discovered and one of them has been raised. It is a craft built of logs, about eighty feet long and capable of carrying six or seven guns. Mr. C. M. Burton is undertaking the work of bringing the other vessels to the surface.

Mr. C. F. Adams has printed in advance from the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, second series, Volume XIX., a paper on "John Quincy Adams and Speaker Andrew Stevenson of Virginia; an Episode of the Twenty-second Congress", in which, after discussing the relations of John Quincy Adams as chairman of the Committee on Manufactures to the tariff adjustment of 1832, he prints considerable portions of his diary for the summer of that year, not included in the published *Memoirs*, and reprints from the *National Intelligencer* a formal letter of Adams to the speaker dated July 11, 1832, arguing the constitutionality of protective tariffs.

Among the publications called forth by the recent Garrison centenary may be noted *Garrison, the Non-Resistant*, by Ernest Crosby (Chicago, Public Publishing Company), and *The Abolitionists, together with Personal Memories of the Struggle for Human Rights, 1830-1864*, by John F. Hume (Putnams).

Volumes XXII.-XXIV. of Thwaites's *Early Western Travels*, also  
AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—49.

published separately, contain "Travels in the Interior of North America", by Maximilian, Prince of Wied, translated from the German by Hannibal Evans Lloyd, reprinted from the London edition of 1843, with an appendix containing Indian vocabularies and other material omitted from the London edition. Maximilian was in America from July, 1832, to July, 1834, spending the larger part of the time along the Missouri.

*Across the Plains in '65*, by Frank C. Young (Denver, privately printed, 1905, pp. 224), is described in its subtitle as "A Youngster's Journal, from 'Gotham' to 'Pike's Peak'". The author was one of a party of young men who left New York in March, 1865, arrived in Atchison after five days of railroading, and in Denver on the forty-second day from Atchison. A map shows the location of the road along the Platte which was followed in the journey.

*Some Phases of the Civil War*, by Charles Francis Adams, "An appreciation and criticism of Mr. James Ford Rhodes's fifth volume", is reprinted from the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Mr. Adams points out that Confederate historians have greatly understated the fighting strength of the South in putting it at 600,000 men; urges that greater attention should be paid to the element of sea-control as a factor in Federal success; dwells upon the extreme severity of Sherman's Atlanta campaign; and discusses the influence of General Butler on the Wilderness campaign.

A publication of first importance bearing on the history of the Confederacy is *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Confederacy, including the Diplomatic Correspondence, 1861-1865*, edited by J. D. Richardson (Nashville, Tenn., United States Publishing Company, 2 vols., 1905). This compilation, for the publication of which permission was given by resolution of Congress, contains the messages and proclamations of President Davis, a few acts of the Confederate Congress, the provisional constitution, the diplomatic correspondence of the Confederate State Department, and biographical sketches of Lee, Davis, A. H. Stephens, Toombs, R. M. T. Hunter, and Judah P. Benjamin. This material is taken, according to the prefatory note, from the archives in Washington, presumably from the captured Confederate archives in the War Department, and from what are known as the "Pickett Papers" in the Treasury Department.

*The Ku Klux Klan: its Origin, Growth, and Disbandment* (Neale Publishing Company) is a reprint of an account by J. C. Lester and D. L. Wilson, published over twenty years ago. Major Lester was one of the six original members of the parent chapter, and his narrative, edited with introduction, notes, and valuable appendixes by W. H. Fleming, is an important source of information respecting the organization.

## LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

The new library building for the Maine Historical Society, erected on the Longfellow estate on Congress Street, Portland, is now nearly completed and will be occupied during the present year. It is of fire-proof construction, with mosaic floors, steel book-stacks, and vaults for the society's archives.

By the recent death of Mrs. John S. H. Fogg of Boston the Maine Historical Society has come into possession of the famous collection of autograph letters and documents bequeathed to the society by Dr. Fogg in 1893. This is one of the most complete collections of autographs of representative Americans in existence. It is arranged in fifty-nine folio volumes, and includes two complete sets of autographs of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, autographs of members of the Continental Congress, of members of the Annapolis Convention, of signers of the Constitution, of colonial governors, of Revolutionary officers, of presidents of the United States, of statesmen, literary personages, and many others.

We have received an attractive pamphlet of sixteen pages: *The Depredation at Pemaquid in August, 1689*, by Victor H. Paltsits, being a paper read before the Maine Historical Society in 1900, and now privately printed. It deals "specifically, with Pemaquid during the last months of the administration of Sir Edmund Andros, and with the capitulation and destruction of Fort Charles under the new Boston government".

*Sebastian Ralé [sic]; a Maine Tragedy of the Eighteenth Century* (Boston, Heintzemann Press) by J. F. Sprague, deals with Father Rasle's work among the Indians, and his death in the destruction of Norridgewalk in 1724. The ethical aspects of the affair are chiefly dwelt upon, a chapter or so is included respecting the Maine Indians, and four original documents are printed: three letters from Father Rasle, 1720-1723, and Lieutenant-governor Dummer's letter to Governor Vaudreuil of January 19, 1725.

A new publication in which history is to have a place is the *Granite State Monthly*, edited at Manchester, New Hampshire, by G. Waldo Browne. It is apparent from the prospectus, and from the contents of the first number, that while the magazine will have many articles of historical flavor, there will be few of first importance to the student. Nevertheless, the first instalment of a good document should be noted, "Wheeler's Narrative", an account of Captain Thomas Wheeler's expedition to Quabaug, now Brookfield, Massachusetts, in 1675, edited by William Plumer, jr.

In the *New Hampshire Genealogical Record* for October, 1905, is printed an entertaining document: "Journal of Rev. John Pike, 1678-1709". John Pike was the ninth minister of Dover, New Hampshire, and his journal (the original is in the possession of the Massachusetts



Historical Society) is divided into three parts: "A Memorandum of Personal Occurrences", "Observable Seasons", and "Observable Providences", the last being an account of the principal happenings in Dover and vicinity from 1682 to 1709, with special attention to the frequent murders and depredations by the Indians.

A modest volume which seems admirably to serve its purpose is *A History of Norwich, Vermont*, by Henry V. Partridge (Hanover, N. H., Dartmouth Press). The book, which is published by the town, was commenced by the late M. E. Goddard. It is in two parts, historical and biographical, the sketches in the latter being of individuals no longer living, a feature which might well be copied in other local histories of like character.

The Essex Institute has issued a subject and author index in ninety-one pages, prepared by Mr. G. F. Dow, to the first forty volumes of its *Historical Collections* (1859-1905).

We have received from the publisher, Eben Putnam, Boston, a sumptuous genealogical work in two volumes: *The Converse Family and Allied Families*, by Charles Allen Converse. Aside from the purely genealogical material, which appears to be well arranged, and is profusely illustrated with portraits, there are documents of more general interest included in the several appendixes. Among these may be mentioned a letter from Ferdinando Gorges to Sir Richard Edgcumbe, one of the patentees of New England, dated April 17, 1623. Another interesting document is a deposition by William Kellogg of Nobletown (July 9, 1766) respecting "an Affray which happened the 26th of June between John Van Ranslaer Esq. and a number of the Inhabitants of a place called Nobletown and parts adjacent". A large amount of material from parish records and other English sources has been included.

The *Vital Records of the Town of Halifax, Massachusetts*, have been published by the Massachusetts Society of Mayflower Descendants.

The *Governors of Connecticut*, by Frederick C. Norton (Hartford, Connecticut Magazine Company), is a reprint in book form of the biographical sketches of Connecticut's fifty-nine governors that have been appearing in the *Connecticut Magazine*. The sketches are very short, but are well illustrated with portraits, and the volume is of most attractive appearance.

Henry Holt and Company announce *A Political History of the State of New York, 1777-1861*, in two volumes by Hon. D. S. Alexander.

A history of the New York Historical Society has recently been published: *The New York Historical Society, 1804-1904*, by Robert H. Kelhy. It is illustrated with portraits of the founders and presidents of the society, and contains lists of the society's officers and members from its organization. A valuable feature of the book is a complete list of



all the publications of the society, giving the contents of each volume of the *Collections*.

*The Minute Book of the Committee of Safety of Tryon County*, announced in these columns some months ago, has been published by Dodd, Mead, and Company. As a product of the press it has unusual merit. The document is now printed verbatim for the first time, and extends from August 27, 1774, to November 24, 1775, the last few pages of the manuscript being lost. An introduction has been provided by J. Howard Hanson, and notes by Samuel L. Frey.

A volume entitled *Memorials of Peter A. Jay* has been edited by John Jay and printed for private circulation. Peter A. Jay, the son of John Jay, was born in 1776; he was a member of the New York constitutional convention of 1821 and a prominent New York lawyer. The volume consists largely of correspondence.

The United States Catholic Historical Society has published as the third number of its Monograph Series a *Historical Sketch of St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary* at Troy, New York, by the Right Reverend Henry Gabriels. Two short articles by Charles G. Herbermann serve as introductory matter: "Life of Bishop Henry Gabriels", and "Early New York Seminaries".

Among the contributions in *Year Book No. 10* of the Oneida Historical Society, 1905, may be noted "The Mohawk Valley: a Channel of Civilization", by A. L. Byron-Curtiss, "Colonization of Civil Government in the Tropics", by S. L. Parrish, and "The Genius of Anglo-Saxon Law and Institutions Contrasted with the Latin Civilization of Imperialism", by W. T. Gibson.

Volume XXV. of the *New Jersey Archives*, consisting of extracts from American newspapers relating to New Jersey, for the years 1766, 1767, and 1768, is in the hands of the binders, and is expected to be issued within the next month or two. These newspaper extracts chronicle the contemporary agitation for the repeal of the Stamp Act, the demonstrations by the "Sons of Liberty" in New Jersey in connection with and subsequent to the repeal of that act, and the manifest tendency of public opinion toward American independence of Parliamentary control.

In the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for October, 1905, is printed the first instalment of Washington's household account-book, 1793-1797, recently purchased by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. "The Narrative of Marie le Roy and Barbara Leininger", who were captured by the Indians in 1755 near Fort Schamockin and held in captivity for three years, is translated from the rare German pamphlet of 1759. Among other contributions in this number should be noted a group of letters selected from the "Peters Papers", of dates between 1741 and 1743, and 1753 and 1755, and the first part of the orderly-book, 1776, of Anthony Wayne's Fourth Pennsylvania Battalion.

In *Notes and Queries* are selections from the correspondence of Clinton and Haldimand, 1781, respecting Benedict Arnold. An interesting document is a report by Charles Thomson, of the ceremonies in Congress May 13, 1782, attending the official notification of the birth of a Dauphin of France. This account was suppressed and does not appear in the printed journal. In the January number should be noted the frontispiece, a portrait in colors, beautifully executed, of Benjamin Franklin. The leading article is by Hampton L. Carson, "William Penn as a Law-Giver", while in *Notes and Queries* are several letters from Timothy Pickering to James and John McHenry, contributed by Bernard C. Steiner, and some correspondence of Anthony Wayne.

Of works relating to Pennsylvania should be noted *A Pioneer Outline History of Northwestern Pennsylvania*, by James W. McKnight (Lippincott), and *Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania*, by A. K. McClure, to be published by John C. Winston in two large and well-illustrated volumes.

In the last biennial report of the Commissioner of the Land Office of Maryland it is stated that the Public Records Commission, appointed in accordance with an act of 1904, has practically completed its examination of all the public records of the state, Baltimore city, and the various counties, and that a detailed report has been deposited in the Land Office. The recommendation is made that the legislature order the printing of this report and establish the office of State Archivist. The Commission consisted of Mrs. H. C. Richardson, Dr. Louis Steiner, and Mr. S. K. Dennis.

Under the editorship of Wilbur F. Coyle the earliest records of Baltimore have been published in a small volume: *First Records of Baltimore Town and Jones' Town, 1729-1797*. An exact copy of the first record-book has been printed, illustrated with facsimiles and maps. It consists of the proceedings of the commission which selected the site for Baltimore, and had charge of the laying out of streets, the disposal of lots, etc. The records for Baltimore extend from 1729 to 1747; those for Jones' Town from 1732, when it was laid out, to 1741, when it was united with Baltimore.

Of most historical interest in the January *South Atlantic Quarterly* are a biographical sketch of John Motley Morehead, governor of North Carolina, 1841-1845, by Professor C. A. Smith, and the second part of "Some Facts about John Paul Jones", by Junius Davis, in which further evidence is produced to show the intimate relations between the naval hero and the North Carolina brothers, Allen and Willie Jones.

In the *Sewanee Review* for January is an interesting contribution of documents by Bernard C. Steiner: these are selections from the letters of William Smith, United States minister to Portugal, written to his intimate friend James McHenry, Secretary of War during the years 1797-1799. They are interesting for the "glimpses they give of society at

the Portuguese court, the report of events which were occurring in the great war then being waged between France and England, and the reflections on American politics, as they appeared to an ardent partisan in European surroundings".

The Virginia State Library will very shortly publish its second volume of the *Journals of the House of Burgesses*, edited by John P. Kennedy. The years covered are those from 1768 to 1772 inclusive. Another publication by the library, which will appear within a few days, will contain a complete list of the transcripts and abstracts from the British archives, some six thousand in number, in the possession of the library, as well as a report on the public records preserved in the State Library and on the records of the various counties.

More extended notice will be given in a later issue to *An Introduction to the Records of the Virginia Company of London*, by Miss Susan M. Kingsbury, published by the Library of Congress. A bibliographical list of the records of the company is included as an appendix.

Aside from continuations, the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for January contains a reprint of a pamphlet published at Williamsburg, by order of Governor Dinwiddie, in 1756, containing the treaty, and the proceedings relative thereto, negotiated with the Catawba and Cherokee Indians in February and March, 1756. During the coming year the publication of important Revolutionary orderly-books, in the possession of the Virginia Historical Society, will be commenced. At the October meeting of the society it was decided to establish an annual prize, in the name of the society, for the best monograph by a student in any Virginia college or university, based on researches in Virginia county records.

In the course of a recent investigation in the Bureau of Rolls and Library of the Department of State, several thousand papers belonging to the state archives of North Carolina were brought to light. Among them were found a petition from the outlawed Regulators praying Governor Martin for protection, letters from delegates to the Continental Congress and from the first representatives and senators, a part of the missing journal of the Council of State, 1777-1780, papers relating to the assumption of the North Carolina debt, drafts of bills and resolutions, petitions, reports of committees, and miscellaneous papers and letters. The documents cover the years 1755-1835, but are mainly from 1775 to 1795. It is not known how this material came to be in the Department of State, but it is not improbable that it was taken from the state capitol during the Federal occupation of Raleigh. A resolution directing its return to North Carolina was introduced into Congress, and the material has been given back to the state.

Of rather more historical value than is usual in the case of such publications is the *Biographical History of North Carolina*, edited by Samuel A. Ashe (Greensboro, N. C., C. L. Van Noppen). This two-

volume publication contains biographical sketches of about one hundred and fifty of the most prominent North-Carolinians from colonial times to the present. The selection appears to have been made wisely, on the whole, and many of the sketches have been prepared by historical writers of reputation.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for October contains a number of interesting letters from Henry Laurens to his son, written from Congress during 1779. We note a plea by the South Carolina Historical Society for historical manuscripts. There are many such in private hands in South Carolina, and it is to be hoped that their owners will respond in generous fashion.

*Reconstruction in South Carolina, 1865-1877*, by John S. Reynolds (Columbia, S. C., The State Company), first appeared as weekly contributions to the Sunday edition of the *State*. A vast amount of information has been gathered together, taken in large part, apparently, from newspaper files.

Volume VI. of the *Collections* of the Georgia Historical Society, published during the last year, contains the letters of James Habersham, 1756-1775.

Of most historical interest in *The "Old Northwest" Genealogical Quarterly* for January, 1906, are three biographical articles: "Jeremiah Morrow", first representative to Congress from Ohio, United States senator, and governor, by Josiah Morrow (to be continued); "Captain Benjamin Brown", an account of his Revolutionary service, by W. F. Gilmore; and "General Arthur St. Clair", by W. H. Hunter.

The larger part of the January issue of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* is devoted to an illustrated article on the "Baum Prehistoric Village" in Ross County, Ohio, by William C. Mills.

The *Centennial History of Butler County, Ohio*, edited by B. S. Bartlow and others (B. F. Bowen and Company), is distinguished from the majority of publications of its class by the inclusion in its historical section of an original document of considerable value. This is the diary, now first printed, by Winthrop Sargent, colonel and adjutant-general on General St. Clair's staff during the expedition of 1791. The earlier part of the diary, to October 7, was lost in the battle of November 4, but Sargent utilized his memory and such material as he had to furnish an account from August to October 7. From the latter date, however, until November 19, the original diary with its detailed daily entries was preserved. A narrative of the defeat of November 4 follows the entry for November 19.

The *Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History* has completed its first year with sufficient support to warrant its continuation. One may perhaps express the hope that circumstances will allow the magazine to develop a rather more substantial historical character. In the last number of the first volume "Historic Houses and Personages of Center-

ville" and "The Richmond and Brookville Canal" may be mentioned, while "Recollections of Early Brookville" is from a manuscript of John M. Johnson, written some twenty-five years ago.

The first *Circular* of the Illinois State Historical Society is by the librarian, Mrs. Jesse P. Weber: *An Outline for the Study of Illinois State History*, to which is added a "reference list from the books, and other historical material" in the library.

The Chicago Historical Society has recently acquired by purchase a collection of 206 documents and letters in French dated in the seventeenth century, and containing grants, deeds, and other legal instruments, business papers, accounts, etc. Signatures of many of the well-known French pioneers are to be found in the collection, which has considerable value historically. Another recent purchase is a portion of the Kingsbury Papers. These consist of post returns, correspondence, and letter-books of Colonel Jacob Kingsbury, who was for many years stationed at Detroit, Mackinac, and Bellefontaine. The papers are particularly interesting on account of letters from Captain John Whistler, Captain Nathan Heald, and Lieutenant Helm, while they were stationed at Fort Dearborn. There are some 300 pieces in the collection, covering the period from 1804 to 1811.

The Kaskaskia records, for years believed to have been destroyed, have been discovered safely stored on the top of the bookcases in the circuit clerk's office in Chester, Illinois. The Illinois State Historical Library sent C. W. Alvord of the state university into the field last summer to search in the local archives for historical material, and this find was the most important among several of great interest. The collection contains about 3,500 papers and books, representing nearly one-half of the documents redated at Fort de Chartres and Kaskaskia during the years 1720 to 1790. The majority consists of private instruments drawn up by notaries; but besides these the court records, private and public letters, and political papers are numerous and important. So scarce have been the local sources for the history of the Northwest during the eighteenth century that this large collection coming from the most important centre of the French communities will throw light on many hitherto obscure events and institutions. The greatest number of the records date from the period of the French régime, but both the period of the British and that of the Virginia occupation are fully represented by papers of every description dating from almost every week until the year 1790. The collection is at present in the library of the University of Illinois, and its contents will be made public as soon as possible.

*Historic Illinois*, by Randall Parrish (Chicago, A. C. McClurg, 1905), does not pretend to merit as an original piece of investigation, but is an attempt to present the more interesting and picturesque features and incidents of Illinois history, with a view to making that history attractive "to the many who seldom discover it to be so".

The Wisconsin Historical Society, being about to publish a descriptive catalogue of its own extensive manuscript collections, recently proposed to other libraries, societies, and private collectors in its neighborhood to append thereto similar descriptions of such of their manuscripts as bear upon American history. Favorable responses were received from the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio, the Old Northwest Genealogical Society, Mr. C. M. Burton, of Detroit, the Chicago Historical Society, the Chicago Public Library, the Newberry Library of Chicago, Mr. Edward E. Ayer of Chicago, the Minnesota Historical Society, the State Historical Society of Iowa, the Missouri Historical Society, the Mercantile Library of St. Louis, Mr. Louis Hauck of Cape Girardeau, Missouri, the State Historical Society of Missouri, and the Kansas Historical Society. The publication of these lists of manuscripts under one cover and commonly indexed will prove helpful to students of American history by enabling them to ascertain the strength of nearly all the several collections in the upper Mississippi basin, at the minimum expenditure of time and effort.

The Wisconsin society has recently received the papers of the late Moses M. Strong, territorial surveyor of Wisconsin, plotter of several of the earliest cities of the state, and author of a *Territorial History of Wisconsin*. The collection is especially rich in manuscript maps of town-sites, details of early land transactions, and political documents.

The Minnesota Historical Society will resume work in April on the very extensive archaeological collections of the late Honorable J. V. Brower, which he had gathered during several years of field explorations in Minnesota and other states of the Northwest for this society's museum. Professor N. H. Winchell, who from 1872 to 1902 was the Minnesota state geologist, will have charge of this work, to arrange the collections for exhibition, and to prepare a volume for publication by the society in its series of *Historical Collections*. This volume is designed to treat of the mound-builders, with maps of many groups of mounds in this state, and of the Dakotas (Sioux) and Ojibways (Chippewas), who occupied the area of Minnesota from the period of European discovery until the settlement by white immigrants.

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for January contains an elaborate study by S. C. Nelson of "Presidential Influence on the Policy of Internal Improvements". In appendixes are listed in tabular form all the appropriations for internal improvements through Buchanan's administration, the presidential vetoes of internal improvement bills, and the principal acts of legislation for the promotion of railroad enterprise. In the same number is an account by Charles Aldrich of "Incidents Connected with the History of the Thirty-second Iowa Infantry". Under the heading "Historical Societies", in the back part of the issue, is much interesting information relating to recent historical activity, mainly in the West.

Among the contributions to the *Annals of Iowa* for January may be noted a sketch of Colonel Thomas Cox, by Harvey Reid; "The Dunkers in Iowa", by J. E. Mohler; and "Acquisition of Iowa Lands from the Indians", from the State Census Report of 1905. In the editorial department is a timely plea for the preservation of local archives.

The Missouri Historical Society has recently received from the estate of the late Melvin L. Gray an important collection of manuscripts known as the Sublette Papers. There are about six hundred documents ranging in date from 1827 to about 1860, or a little later. They relate to the Upper Missouri fur-trade and to the Santa Fé trade. Among other accessions should be noted a collection of twenty-six manuscripts relating to the early settlement and later history of Ste. Genevieve, the oldest town in the state of Missouri; the papers and minutes of the State Union Club of Missouri, bearing on the history of the Civil War; and ten volumes of correspondence between the Wilt Brothers in St. Louis and their uncle, Joseph Hertzog, in Philadelphia during the years 1812-1815. The letters are largely concerned with business affairs, but contain a good deal of material of historical interest.

The Arkansas History Commission, created by an act of April 27, 1905, has in preparation a full report on the sources of Arkansas history, similar in scope and plan to those published in Alabama and Mississippi. It will be printed as the first volume of the Arkansas Historical Association publications.

The October *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association is mainly devoted to an elaborate article by Herbert E. Bolton on "The Spanish Abandonment and Re-Occupation of East Texas, 1773-1779". The January number contains three biographical sketches: "Valentine Bennet", by Marie B. Urwitz; "Captain John Sowers Brooks", by General John E. Roller; and "Colonel William G. Cooke", by Harry Warren. Of these, the latter two are composed mainly of letters.

Some documentary material relating to Texas has been published by H. P. N. Gammel of Austin: *Speeches and State Papers of James Stephen Hogg*, edited by C. W. Raines. A sketch of Governor Hogg's life is included.

The State Historical Society of North Dakota is about to publish its first volume of *Collections*. This will appear as one of the public documents of the state, and will contain considerable material relating to the Indians.

*A Brief History of South Dakota* (American Book Company), by "Doane" Robinson, is a text-book adapted to the higher grades in elementary schools. The history is in the form of successive narratives, based on important historical events.

The first volume of an *Illustrated History of Nebraska*, begun under the editorship of the late J. S. Morton and continued by Albert Watkins and Dr. G. L. Miller (Lincoln, Neb., J. North and Company), contains



a detailed account (over 570 pages of double columns) of the territorial history of Nebraska. In the second volume will appear the later history of the state, and the historical accounts of its various institutions.

In *University of Colorado Studies*, vol. III., number 1, is a short paper by Professor F. L. Paxson, in a field hitherto unworked, "The Territory of Jefferson: a Spontaneous Commonwealth". Another contribution by the same writer, "The Historical Opportunity in Colorado", is a general survey of the accessible materials for Colorado history, with some account of what has already been done in that field.

We note in the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society for September articles on "The Unity of History", by H. W. Scott, and on "Aspects of Oregon History before 1840", by E. G. Bourne. In the same number Dr. John Scouler's "Journal of a Voyage to N. W. America", noted before in these columns, is completed, as is in the December number the reprint of the papers of David Douglas. In the March *Quarterly* appear the first instalments of the Oregon material in the *Annals of Congress*, and of the reprint from the 1846 edition of Overton Johnson and W. H. Winter's *Route Across the Rocky Mountains with a Description of Oregon and California*. Johnson and Winter were in the migration of 1843, contemporary records of which are very rare. Among the recent manuscript acquisitions of the Oregon Historical Society should be noted the correspondence of Addison C. Gibbs, governor of Oregon from 1862 to 1866 and, several years later, United States district attorney.

*Pioneer Days of Oregon History*, by S. A. Clarke (J. K. Gill Company, Portland, Oregon), is a two-volume work dealing with the history of Oregon from the discovery to the establishment of territorial government. Much material not of strictly historical character has been incorporated, such as the recollections of missionaries, trappers, fur-traders, and others, Indian traditions, and accounts of romantic or picturesque events.

We note the recent organization of the Santa Clara County Historical Society in California. Its first meeting was held in San José in December, at which Reverend Father Gleeson, President of Santa Clara College, read a paper on "The Founding of Santa Clara Mission". Professor C. A. Duniway is president of the new organization, and Agnes E. Howe secretary.

*Studies in Moro History, Law, and Religion*, by Najeeb M. Saleeby, is printed as the first part of volume IV. of the *Publications* of the Ethnological Survey in the Department of the Interior. It deals with the history, genealogy, and mythology of Magindanao (Mindanao) and with the laws of the Moros, giving in full the two Sulu codes. A number of facsimiles of manuscripts are presented, and literal translations of various documents are included.

A convenient compendium is A. P. Cockburn's *Political Annals of*



*Canada, 1608-1905* (Toronto, W. Briggs). The provinces are treated separately until the union of 1841, then follow the history of the Province of Canada to 1867, and the history of the Dominion from 1867 to 1905. A list of important dates, a copy of the act of 1867, and lists of the first members of the Dominion and Provincial Parliaments are included in appendixes.

A fifth edition of F. X. Garneau's *History of Canada*, revised by his grandson, M. Hector Garneau, is to be published. M. Garneau will also publish the correspondence of his grandfather and of his father (Alfred Garneau), and a study of his own on the French families that came to Canada in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

*Canadian Life in Town and Country*, by H. J. Morgan and Lawrence J. Burpe, has been added to the interesting series published by George Newnes (London). Of most historical interest are the chapters on the political and judicial systems, and the bibliography.

The latest addition to "The Makers of Canada" series (Toronto, Morang) is *John Graves Simcoe*, by Duncan C. Scott.

A bibliography of Quebec has been published by Dr. N. E. Dionne, Librarian for the Legislature of Quebec: *Inventaire Chronologique des Livres, Brochures, Journaux et Revues Publiés en Langue Française dans la Province de Québec, depuis l'Établissement de l'Imprimerie au Canada jusqu' à nos jours, 1764-1905*. This is to be followed by a list of all the books, pamphlets, newspapers, and reviews published in English in Quebec and by a list of all published works relating to the province.

The Literary and Historical Society of Quebec has published a volume of documents relating to the blockade of Quebec in 1775-1776 by the American Revolutionists. The documents included are Ainslie's "Journal of the most remarkable occurrences in the Province of Quebec from . . . September 1775 until . . . the sixth of May 1776" (the original is among the Sparks Papers in the Harvard Library); "Journal of the most remarkable occurrences . . . since . . . the 14th November, 1775", by an officer of the garrison (the same, with some variations, as that printed in the *Collections* of the New York Historical Society, 1880); the orderly-book kept by Captain Anthony Vialar and continued by Captain Robert Lester; a list, compiled by L. H. Irving, of the officers of the First Battalion of Royal Highland Emigrants; and two French muster-rolls of the Canadian militia. The documents are edited by Frederick C. Würtele.

An important work on Cuban history should have received earlier attention in these volumes: *Introducción a la Historia de las Instituciones Locales de Cuba*, by Dr. F. Carrera y Justiz (Havana, 2 vols., 1905); it is a thorough treatment of the development of local institutions in Cuba from the earliest settlement until the end of Spanish control.

Under the title of *El Conde de Raousset-Boulbon en Sonora* (México, Museo Nacional, 1905, pp. 90) Señor Genaro García has edited with an introduction and a number of appended documents a hitherto unpublished narrative written by Colonel M. M. Giménez in 1862 regarding the expedition to Sonora in 1852 (undertaken by himself and Count Raousset-Boulbon in behalf of the *Compania Restauradora del Mineral de Arizona*) and the results of the expedition. The narrative gives numerous details not known to be elsewhere recorded and is of special interest as the work of the nominal chief of the expedition.

Hurst and Blackett (London) are bringing out a life of Porfirio Diaz, by Mrs. Alec Tweedie.

Students of South-American history should note a recent French publication: *Joseph Dombey, Explorateur du Pérou, du Chili et du Brésil, 1778-1785* (Paris, E. Guilmoto), by Dr. E. T. Hamy.

We have received a carefully prepared paper by Assistant Professor Albert G. Keller on "Portuguese Colonization in Brazil", reprinted as a separate from the *Yale Review* for February.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. H. McCarthy, *The Presentation of American History* (Catholic University Bulletin, January); *Catholics and the American Revolution* (American Catholic Historical Researches, January); John Hay, *Franklin in France* (Century, January); Mary C. Crawford, *Franklin and the French Intriguers* (Appleton's Booklovers Magazine, February); Emlin McClain, *Written and Unwritten Constitutions in the United States* (Columbia Law Review, February); *The Growth of American Foreign Policy* (Edinburgh Review, January); William S. Rossiter, *The First American Imperialist, M. C. Perry* (North American Review, February); Charles W. Stewart, *Early American Visitors to Japan* (Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute, December); Frederick T. Hill, *Lincoln the Lawyer* (running in the Century); Emerson D. Fite, *The Agricultural Development of the West during the Civil War* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, February); James Schouler, *President Johnson and Negro Suffrage* (Outlook, January 13); Joseph B. Bishop, *A Friendship with John Hay* (Century, March).